ENVER HOXHA

YUGOSLAV "SELF-ADMINISTRATION" A CAPITALIST THEORY AND PRACTICE

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

ENVER HOXHA

YUGOSLAV "SELF-ADMINISTRATION" - A CAPITALIST THEORY AND PRACTICE

(against E. Kardelj's anti-socialist views expressed in the book «Directions of the Development of the Political System of Socialist Self-administration»)

THE INSTITUTE OF MARXIST-LENINIST STUDIES
AT THE CC OF THE PLA

THE «8 NËNTORI» PUBLISHING HOUSE
TIRANA, 1978

A great deal of publicity is being given to a book published in Yugoslavia last year under the title «Directions of the Development of the Political System of Socialist Self-administration», by the leading «theoretician» of Titoite revisionism, Eduard Kardelj.

The anti-Marxist ideas of this book were the basis of the entire proceedings of the 11th Congress of the revisionist party of Yugoslavia, to which the Titoites, in an effort to disguise its bourgeois character, have given the name: «The League of Communists of Yugoslavia».

As the 7th Congress of the PLA pointed out, the Titoites and international capitalism are publicizing the system of «self-administration» as «a ready-made and tested road to socialism», and are using it as a favourite weapon in their struggle against socialism, the revolution and liberation struggles.

In view of its danger, I think I must express some opinions about this book.

As is known, capitalism has been fully established in Yugoslavia, but this capitalism is cunningly disguised. Yugoslavia poses as a socialist State, but one of a special kind, which the world has never seen before! Indeed, the Titoites even boast that their State has nothing in common with the first socialist State which emerged from the October Socialist Revolution and which was founded by Lenin and Stalin on the basis of the scientific theory of Marx and Engels.

Right from the start the Yugoslav renegades deviated from the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism on the socialist State and have worked to prevent the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, so that Yugoslavia would proceed on the road of capitalism.

On another occasion, I have explained that both prior to and after the liberation of Yugoslavia, the Titoite renegade group, which disguised itself and posed as a supporter of the socialist system established in the Soviet Union, and which trumpeted that it would build socialism on the basis of the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism, in reality was opposed to this ideology and the Soviet revolutionary experience. This correct conclusion emerges clearly from the content of Kardelj's book, too.

1. - A Brief Excursion in the History of the Titoite Revisionists

The national liberation war of Yugoslavia under the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, was the embodiment of the valour and courage of the people, and the honesty of the genuine communists of Yugoslavia. During this war, however, certain dubious trends appeared, which made one think that in its stand towards the anti-fascist alliance of the Soviet Union, the United States of America and Britain, the Tito group leaned rather towards the Anglo-Americans, and this became quite clear later. At that time, we observed that the Titoite leadership maintained very close contacts with the Western allies, especially with the British, from whom it

received first-rate financial and military aid. Likewise, we were struck by the obvious political rapprochement between Tito and Churchill and his envoys, at a time when the national liberation war of Yugoslavia ought to have been closely linked with the liberation war of the Soviet Union, because the hope for the all-round liberation of all the peoples, as far as the external factor was concerned, was precisely this war.

The tendencies of the Titoite leadership to oppose the Soviet Union became more evident on the eve of the victory over fascism, when the Red Army, in hot pursuit of the German armies, entered Yugoslavia to assist the national liberation war there. Especially at the time when the conclusions of this great war were being reached among the great and small belligerent powers, it was obvious that Titoite Yugoslavia had the support of British and US imperialism. At that time, the diplomatic and ideological frictions between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia grew more evident. Among other things, these differences were over territorial problems. Yugoslavia claimed territories in the North, especially on its border with Italy. But it was silent about its southern borders, especially its border with Albania, about Kosova and the Albanian territories in Macedonia and Montenegro. The Titoites could not speak about them, because they would encroach upon the chauvinistic platform of the Serbian nationalists.

Now it is common knowledge that the differences between the Yugoslav leadership and Stalin were deep-rooted. The revisionist views of the Yugoslav leading group were crystallized long before the liberation of their country, possibly

since the time when the Communist Party of Yugoslavia took part in the Comintern and worked in total illegality under the regime of the Serbian kings. Even at that time, its leadership had deviationist, Trotskyite views, which the Comintern condemned whenever they were expressed. Later Tito «wiped off» the condemnations of the Comintern, even going so far as to rehabilitate the greatest deviationist, Gorkich, the former general secretary of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia.

After the liberation of Yugoslavia a problem of great importance arose: what direction was Yugoslavia to take? This direction, of course, would depend to a great extent on whether the world outlook of the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia was Marxist-Leninist, or revisionist. They passed themselves off as Marxist-Leninists, and at first, that is what we believed them to be. In fact, however, from their activity not only in general, but also from their concrete attitudes towards us, we observed that many things about them were not in conformity with the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism. We saw that they were deviating as far as possible from the experience of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union.

The tendency of the Yugoslav leading group, headed by Tito, Kardelj, Rankovich, Gilas, as was noticed as early as the time of their illegal activity, but especially after the liberation of Yugoslavia, was that the Communist Party of Yugoslavia should not come out openly under its own name, but should be disguised, as it was, under the cloak of the so-called Popular Front of Yugoslavia. This illegality was justified under the pre-

text that otherwise they risked «alarming and frightening the big and petty-bourgeoisie of the city and countryside», which «might abandon the new State power which had emerged from the revolution», and that «the Anglo-American allies might be frightened by communism». Efforts were made to convince the bourgeoisie that the communists were not in power, that the communist party, though it existed, was, so to say, a participant in a broad front, in which Mihailovich's men, and Nedich's men, and Stoyadinovich's men and the men of all the other reactionary - viches in Yugoslavia could participate.

Tito formed a provisional government with Subashich, former prime minister of the royal government in exile in London, but under constant pressure from the people he did not permit him to govern very long and liquidated him. At that time he pretended that he had not wanted Subashich but that the allies had imposed him, while later he accused Stalin of the same thing. The truth is that Tito accepted Subashich to please Churchill, because he did not like Stalin.

From the very beginning, the views of Tito and his associates showed that they were far from being «hard-line Marxists», as the bourgeoisie calls the consistent Marxists, but «reasonable Marxists», who would collaborate closely with all the reactionary bourgeois politicians of Yugoslavia, old or new.

Although it posed as being illegal, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia operated legally. Yet Rankovich and Tito did not give it the power and the leading role it should have had, because they were not for the construction of socialism in Yugoslavia. Tito and Rankovich distorted the Marx-

ist-Leninist norms of the structure and the role of the party. The Communist Party of Yugoslavia, from the very beginning, was not built on the basis and the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. This party, which was allegedly merged into the «Popular Front of Yugoslavia», made the law, together with the Army, the Ministry of the Interior and the State Security service. After the war, this party, which had led the war of the Yugoslav peoples, became a detachment of the State organs of repression, which were the Army, the Ministry of the Interior, and the UDB. Together with them, it became an organ of oppression of the working masses, instead of being the vanguard of the working class.

From the propaganda developed and the authority the party had won during the national liberation war and in the initial steps of the construction of Yugoslavia after the war, the Yugoslav working class had the impression that this party was in the vanguard. In reality, it was not the vanguard of the working class, but of a new bourgeois class that had begun to assert itself, that relied strongly on the prestige of the national liberation war of the peoples of Yugoslavia for its own counterrevolutionary aims, while it obscured the perspectives of the construction of the new society. Such a degenerate party was bound to lead Titoite Yugoslavia on to anti-Marxist paths.

The anti-Marxist course of the Yugoslav Titoites, of the Tito-Kardelj-Rankovich group came into open opposition, as it could not fail to do, to Marxism-Leninism, the communist parties, the Soviet Union, Stalin, and all the countries of people's democracy which were created after

the Second World War. Of course, this clash developed gradually, till the critical moment came, when the chaff was sorted from the wheat.

It is an incontestable fact that the peoples of Yugoslavia fought. Yugoslavia made great sacrifices, just as Albania did. The anti-Marxist Yugoslav leaders misused this fight for their own ends. For public opinion at home and abroad, they also exploited the high assessment which the Soviet Union made of Yugoslavia, in which that country was described as an important ally on the Marxist-Leninist road to socialism.

Before long, in their relations with the newly-created States of people's democracy, the Titoites were displaying tendencies to domination, expansion and hegemony, which were apparent everywhere, but more especially in their relations with our country. As we know, they sought to impose their anti-Marxist political, ideological, organizational and State views on us. They went so far as to make despicable attempts to transform Albania into a republic of Yugoslavia. In this disgraceful, but unsuccessful enterprise, the Titoites encountered our determined opposition. At first, our resistance was uncrystallized, because we did not suspect that the Yugoslav leadership had set out on the capitalist and revisionist road. But after some years, when its hegemonic and expansionist tendencies were clearly displayed, we opposed it sternly and unreservedly.

The Titoites tried to impose their will on us by resorting to the most varied kinds of pressure and blackmail. To this end, they also organized the Koçi Xoxe conspiracy. They pursued this same imperialist practice towards other countries, too, like Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, al-

though not to the same extent. All these ugly acts clearly showed that Yugoslavia was not advancing on the road to socialism, but had become a tool in the service of world capitalism.

With each passing day it was becoming clearer that a socialist society of the Leninist type was not being built in Yugoslavia, but that capitalism was developing instead. Meanwhile, the steps taken on this capitalist road were disguised with the alleged quest for a new, specific form of «socialism». Precisely for this purpose, the Yugoslav revisionist leadership with Tito, Kardelj, and Rankovich at the head, in an effort to somehow justify their betrayal «theoretically», borrowed the most varied ideas from the arsenal of the old revisionists, and in this way strengthened their fascist-type State with every possible means. The Army, the Ministry of the Interior, and the UDB became all-powerful.

Though it was establishing capitalism, the Yugoslav revisionist leadership tried to create the opinion among the masses of the people that the war aims were not being betrayed in Yugoslavia, that a State with a socialist orientation existed there in the leadership of which was a communist party that defended Marxism, and allegedly, precisely because of this, it had come into opposition with the Soviet Union, Stalin, the communist parties and the countries of people's democracy.

To protect their positions, badly shaken as a result of their exposure before internal public opinion and in the international communist and workers' movement, the Titoites, in continuation of their deceptive policy, proclaimed that they would take «serious» actions for the construction

of socialism in the countryside, for the collectivization of agriculture according to Leninist principles, and therefore they formed the so-called *zadrugas.* As for the seriousness of the intentions of the Titoite renegades about the construction of socialism in the countryside, it is enough to recall that the *zadrugas* collapsed before they were properly established, and now no trace remains of the collectivization of the Yugoslav countryside.

Up till 1948, when the final rupture came between the Soviet Union, the countries of people's democracy and the international communist movement, on the one hand, and Yugoslavia, on the other, the latter was still in the initial phase of chaotic capitalism, in a state of political, ideological, economic disorganization, in an extremely grave situation. This impelled the Tito-Kardelj-Rankovich group to act more openly, to link itself more closely with world capitalism, especially US imperialism, in order to maintain its power and to change the situation to its advantage.

After 1948, immersed in a grave political, ideological and economic crisis, Yugoslavia found itself at the crossroads, because of the anti-Marxist deviation of its leadership. The Titoite renegades were, so to say, wanting to sit on two «chairs». They wanted to sit on the «chair» of Marxism-Leninism merely for the sake of appearances, only for form's sake, while on the other, the capitalist-revisionist «chair», they wanted to plant themselves firmly; but, in order to achieve this aim, a certain amount of time would be necessary. The period from 1948 onwards was very troubled by grave crises, confusion and chaos.

The Tito-Kardelj-Rankovich group faced the

question: How to hang on to power and crush any resistance of the proletariat and the peoples of Yugoslavia who had fought for socialism in friendship and complete unity with the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy? With this aim in view, the Yugoslav revisionists worked in the first place to liquidate any trace of Marxism-Leninism left in their party, in order to transform it into an instrument of their bourgeois-revisionist ideology and policy, to divest it of any leading function, while converting the working class into an inert mass which must not be given the possibility of seeing their betrayal and acting against it as the decisive political force of the revolution. The norms of democratic centralism in the party were violated. The party was made subordinate to the UDB which was used as a means to suppress all the elements who were not in favour of their retrogressive anti-Marxist turn. The party was «purged» of all those who were loyal to socialism. Though it appeared to retain some norms of elections, meetings, and conferences, in reality its bureaucratic leadership concentrated all power in this allegedly Marxist-Leninist party in its own hands and transformed it into a simple tool implementing its orders and those of the State Security service. Thus the Communist Party of Yugoslavia was radically transformed and lost all the features of the vanguard party of the working class, the leading political force of society. This was a great victory for capitalism, for the foreign and local bourgeoisie.

In order to maintain their domination, the Titoite renegades had to quietly liquidate the State which had emerged from the national li-

Deration war and to build another State, a ferocious fascist dictatorship.

In other words, the Tito-Kardelj-Rankovich leading group undertook the liquidation of all Marxist-Leninist features of the revolution and set out in quest of allegedly new «socialist» roads, which were capitalist in fact, in the economy, internal and foreign policy, education and culture, and in all sectors of life. In this situation, the State Security organs and the Yugoslav Army became the favourite savage weapon in the hands of this handful of renegades, which meted out draconian punishment to anyone who dared denounce the betrayal. The mass persecutions and killings of all sound Marxist-Leninist elements began. The dreadful concentration camps, one of which was that of Goli Otok, were crammed with prisoners and internees.

At that time Yugoslavia's economy was in very bad shape because of the war devastations, the confused policy of the Yugoslav leadership, and because, after the breaking off of all relations with the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia no longer received the considerable aid it had received in the first years after liberation, as well as because it could no longer plunder the other countries of people's democracy, like Albania, through the «joint» companies set up on an unfair basis, which benefited only one side, Yugoslavia.

Certainly, the Yugoslav renegades could not get out of the crisis through terrorism alone. As a long-standing agency of world capitalism, they turned immediately in that direction for aid, and US imperialism, in particular, was ready to give Tito and Co all the aid and support they needed to save their skins and to make them an impor-

tant tool in its fight against socialism, the revolution and liberation movements. The imperialist powers had been waiting impatiently for such turn because they had been prepared for this since the time of the war. Therefore, they did not fail to give them major economic «aid», and also gave them strong political-ideological support. They even supplied them with various weapons and military equipment, and linked them with NATO through the Balkan Pact.

In the first period, Yugoslavia was «aided» by capital investments from foreign companies, especially in industry and agriculture.

In the field of industry, where US imperialism showed itself particularly «generous», its «aid» enabled work to begin for the reconstruction of the old existing factories, so that these could be made more or less operational, and their production could suffice to keep the bourgeois-revisionist regime, which was being crystallized and which had turned its face towards world capitalism, on its feet.

The Titoite regime also had to liquidate that half-baked system of collectivization of agriculture which had been set up in a number of peasant economies and to create a new system in which the kulaks and the big landed proprietors would be favoured again. Forms and means were found for the redistribution of the land, under which the old kulaks were re-established without causing great upheavals in the country. The State adopted a series of capitalist measures, such as the breaking up of the machine and tractor stations and the sale of their equipment to the rich peasantry which could afford to buy them, and the imposition of heavy taxes on the peasants.

The State farms, likewise, were transformed into capitalist enterprises in which foreign capital also was invested, etc.

The local merchants and industrialists, to whom major concessions were made, benefited greatly from the foreign capital invested.

These measures proved beyond any doubt that the «socialism» which was being built in Yugoslavia was nothing other than the road of integration into capitalism.

Thus, the ground was prepared for the penetration of foreign capital on an ever larger scale into a political, ideological and organizational environment very suitable to world capitalism, which, by aiding the Titoite regime, would use it as a bridgehead for its penetration into the other countries of people's democracy.

This political, ideological and economic orientation of Titoite Yugoslavia towards capitalism made the class struggle there take another direction, and develop no longer as a motive force of the socialist society, but as a motive force in the struggle among opposing classes, as is the case with any capitalist State where the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie prevails. The Titoite bourgeois-revisionist State spearheaded the class struggle in Yugoslavia against the progressive elements of the working class, against the communists who resisted the course of betrayal.

Democratic centralism was soon liquidated, also, in the field of the economic and State administration. It is true that in Yugoslavia some factories had been nationalized, the foreign trade had been proclaimed State monopoly and it was alleged that the principle of democratic centralism was implemented in the organization and

activity of the State and the party. But these measures of a seemingly revolutionary character were neither complete nor consistent. The centralism in Yugoslavia did not have the true Leninist meaning that the entire economic and political life of the society should be carried on by combining the centralized leadership with the creative initiative of the local organs and the working masses, but was intended to create a dictatorial force of the fascist type, which would be in a position to impose the will of the regime in power on the peoples of Yugoslavia from above. With the passage of a few years, these initial measures, which were advertized as allegedly socialist tendencies, took a clearly anti-Marxist, counterrevolutionary direction. The entire State organization and State activity in the economic field assumed capitalist features, in open opposition to the fundamental experience of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union of Lenin and Stalin.

In the years following immediately after 1948, we can say that the principle of centralism was implemented in the activity of the Yugoslav State, because the Federation of Yugoslavia had very heavy and difficult burdens which, decentralized, it could not carry with success. The times were such that the preservation of centralism was required, because the Federation was made up of republics, each of them with different nationalist political currents which were seeking to break away from it. But that sort of centralism was bureaucratic centralism, the economic plans were decided from above without being discussed at the base, they were not well-studied and were not designed to promote an harmonious development

of the various branches of the economy of the republics and regions of the Federation, the orders were arbitrary and were executed blindly, the products were procured by force. From this chaos, in which the initiative of the local organs of the party and State and the initiative of the working masses were nowhere to be seen, of course, disagreements were bound to emerge, as they did in fact, and they were suppressed with terror and bloodshed.

Such a situation was encouraged by the capitalist states which had taken the Titoite regime under their wing in order to give Yugoslavia a capitalist orientation. Profiting from this state of affairs, the various imperialists were competing with each other in their efforts to get a tighter grip on this corrupt State, so that, together with the credits they provided, they could also impose their political, ideological and organizational views.

The foreign capitalists who supported the Titoite renegade group recognized clearly that this group would serve them, but they felt, after the turbulent and chaotic situation was overcome, that a more stable situation had to be created in Yugoslavia. Otherwise they could not be sure about the security of the big investments they were making and which they were to increase in the future.

In order to create the desired situation in favour of capitalism, it was necessary to bring about the decentralization of the management of the economy and the recognition and protection by law of the rights of the capitalists who were making large investments in the economy of this State.

The Titoite leadership understood clearly that world capitalism wanted Yugoslavia, as a tool in its hands, to be in the best possible position to deceive others. Consequently, it could not accept a bloodthirsty, openly fascist regime, which the anti-Marxists, Tito-Kardelj-Rankovich had established. For these reasons in 1967 the Tito-Kardelj group took measures and liquidated the Rankovich group, which was made responsible for all the evils of the Titoite rule up till that period.

With the liquidation of Rankovich, the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia did not emerge from the crisis into which it had entered. It continued to be treated according to the old Titoite views, the essence of which was that the League should keep up only its «communist» disguise, but never play the leading role in the State activity, the Army, or in the economy. The Titoites had even changed their party's name, calling it the «League of Communists», allegedly in order to give it an authentic «Marxist» name, taken from the vocabulary of Karl Marx. The only officially recognized role of this so-called «League of Communists» was an educational one. But even this educational role was non-existent, because Yugoslav society, which was lulled to sleep with the propaganda of an allegedly Marxist-Leninist policy and ideology, in the cradle of the so-called «Socialist League of Yugoslavia», was led astray on the capitalist road.

Although it emerged from illegality, as a result of the capitalist decentralization, the Yugoslav revisionist party dissolved into that sort of ideological pluralism which later would be called a «democratic» system. The main aim was that, after the party had been transformed into

a bourgeois party, the capitalist features of the economic development of the country should be completely crystallized.

Thus, suitable ground was prepared in Yugoslavia for the flourishing of anarcho-syndicalist theories, against which Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin had fought. These were the conditions in which the pseudo-Marxist-Leninist theory on the political system of «socialist self-administration», which Kardelj deals with in his book, was concocted.

I have dwelt at some length on the historical side of the evolution of Yugoslavia on the revisionist road, not because these problems are unknown to us, but in order to bring out more clearly the falsity of the «theoretical» ideas of Kardelj, who as Tito's collaborator in the great betrayal of the revolution and socialism, cannot adopt any position other than that which presents white as black and calls capitalism socialism. Now, seeing the inglorious pass to which they have brought their country, these renegades are trying to find «theoretical» justifications for the chaotic situation of which they are the authors. This also explains Kardelj's obscure ideas. The Yugoslav reality is chaotic, and all the «theorizing» about it is confused. It cannot be otherwise.

2. - The System of «Self-administration» in the Economy

The theory and practice of Yugoslav «self-administration» is an outright denial of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the universal laws on the construction of socialism.

The essence of «self-administration socialism» in the economy is the idea that allegedly socialism cannot be built by concentrating the means of production in the hands of the socialist State by creating State ownership as the highest form of socialist ownership, but by fragmenting the socialist State property into property of individual groups of workers, who allegedly administer it directly themselves. As long ago as 1848, Marx, and Engels stressed,

> «*The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organized as the ruling class*».(**1**)

Lenin stressed the same thing when he sternly combated the anarcho-syndicalist views of the anti-party group, the «workers' opposition», which demanded the handing of the factories to the workers and the management and organization of production not by the socialist State, but by a so-called «Congress of producers», as a representative of groups of individual workers. Lenin described these views as representing

> «*... a complete break with Marxism and communism*»(**2**)

He pointed out,

> «*any justification, whether direct or indirect, of the ownership of the workers of an*

1 K. Marx-F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. 1, p. 42 Tirana, 1975, Alb. ed.

2 V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 32, p. 283, Alb. ed

*individual factory or an individual profession over their individual production, or any justification of their right to tone down or hinder the orders from general State power, is a very gross distortion of the fundamental principles of Soviet power and complete renunciation of socialism».(**1**)*

In June 1950, when he presented the law on «self-administration» to the People's Assembly of the People's Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, while propounding his revisionist views on ownership under «socialism», among other things, Tito said, «From now on State property in the means of production, factories, mines, railroads will gradually go over to the highest form of socialist ownership; State ownership is the lowest form of social ownership, not the highest form...»; among «the most characteristic acts of a socialist country», «is the transfer of factories and other economic enterprises from the hands of the State into the hands of the workers, for them to manage...», because in this manner the «slogan of the action of the workers' class — 'Factories to the Workers!' will be realized.»(**2**)

These assertions of Tito's and the reactionary anarcho-syndicalist views of the «worker opposition», which Lenin exposed in his time, are as alike as two drops of water. They are also closely similar to the views of Proudhon, who in his work «The Theory of Property» claimed that «the spon-

---

1 V. I. Lenin, «On Democratization and the Socialist Character of the Soviet Power»

2 «Factories to the Workers», Prishtina 1951, pp. 37, 19, 1.

taneous product of a collective unit... can be considered as the triumph of freedom... and as the greatest revolutionary force which exists and can be opposed to the State». Or, here is what one of the chiefs of the Second International, Otto Bauer, said in his book, «The Road to Socialism»: «Who, then, will lead socialized industry in the future? The government? No! If the government were to run all the branches of industry without exception, it would become extremely powerful over the people and the national representative body. Such an increase of government power would be dangerous to democracy».(**1**)

In unity with Tito's views, E. Kardelj also stresses in his book: «Our society is compelled to act in this manner since it has decided on self-government and the self-governing socialization of the social property, and against the perpetuation of the State-owned form of the socialist relations of production» (p. 66) (**2**). This means that the system of private property has been established in Yugoslavia, and State socialist property, the property of the entire people, does not exist.

Quite the opposite happens in our country, where this common socialist property is managed by the State of the dictatorship of the proletariat with the participation of the working class and the masses of working people in direct, centra-

1 Otto Bauer, «The road to Socialism», Paris, 1919, p. 18.

2. All quotations from E. Kardelj's book are taken from its Albanian translation by the Prishtina Publishing Board in 1977 (Note by the «8 Nentori» Publishing House, Tirana).

lized forms, which are planned from below and orientated from above.

The course of the decentralization of the means of production, according to the anarcho-syndicalist ideas of workers' «self-administration», is, in essence, nothing other than a refined way to preserve and consolidate capitalist private ownership over the means of production, although in a form disguised as «property administered by groups of workers». In fact, all the confused and obscure terms invented by the «theoretician» Kardelj in his book, such as «fundamental organizations of united labour», «complex organizations of united labour», «workers' councils of the fundamental or complex organizations of united labour», «self-administration communities of interests», etc. etc., which have even been written into the law of the Yugoslav capitalist State, are nothing but a glossy facade behind which is hidden the stripping of the working class of its right to ownership over the means of production, its savage exploitation by the bourgeoisie.

This kind of private property exists in Yugoslavia not only in a disguised form but also in its open form, both in town and countryside. This, too, is admitted by E. Kardelj in his book when he says, «in our society such rights as... the right of personal property, or, within given limits, also of private property... have special importance...» (p. 177). Kardelj tries in vain to mitigate the negative effect which the open acceptance of the right to private property might have even in the form of small-scale production, which, as Lenin says, gives birth to capitalism every day

and every hour. The Yugoslav revisionists have issued special laws to encourage the private economy, laws which recognize the citizens' right to «found enterprises» and «to hire labour». The Yugoslav Constitution says expressly: «Private owners have the same socio-economic position, the same rights and obligations as the working people in the socio-economic organizations».

Small private property reigns supreme in the Yugoslav agriculture and occupies nearly 90 per cent of the arable land. Nine million ha. of land belong to the private sector, whereas over 10 per cent, or 1.15 million ha. belong to the monopoly capitalists, or the so-called «social» sector. Over 5 million peasants in Yugoslavia are engaged in working privately-owned land. The Yugoslav countryside has never embarked on the road of genuine socialist transformations. Regarding this situation, Kardelj has not one word to say in his book, and he avoids dealing with the problem of how his «self-administration» system is extended to agriculture. However, if he pretends that socialism is being built through this system, then how is it possible that he should have forgotten about «building socialism» in agriculture, too, which accounts for nearly half the economy? The Marxist-Leninist theory teaches us that socialism is built both in the city and in the countryside, not on the basis of State capitalist ownership, the ownership allegedly administered by workers' groups, or of private ownership in its open form, but only on the basis of socialist social ownership over the means of production.

In Yugoslavia, ownership of 10 to 25 ha. of

land as private property (**1**) is permitted. But the Yugoslav law which permits the buying and selling, renting and mortgaging of land, the buying and selling of agricultural machinery, and hired labour in agriculture, has also created the possibilities for the new bourgeois class of the countryside, the kulaks, to add to the area of their land, means of work and implements, tractors and trucks, at the expense of the poor peasants, and consequently, to step up and intensify their capitalist exploitation.

Capitalist relations of production are so deeply entrenched in the Yugoslav economy that even the capitalists from foreign firms have now a free field of action in making investments and, together with the local bourgeoisie, exploiting the local working class and the other masses of working people in Yugoslavia. The Yugoslav system of «self-administration» can fairly be described as a State of the co-operation of Yugoslav capitalism with US capitalism and other capitalists. They are partners sharing Yugoslavia's assets in everything - in factories, means of communication, hotels, housing, down to the living people.

If the Yugoslav economy has made some steps forward in its development, this is in no way due to the system of «self-administration», as the Titoite revisionists try to make out. Large amounts of capital from the capitalist world, in the form of investments, credits and «aid», have been poured into Yugoslavia and this constitutes a considerable part of the material base of the Yugoslav capitalist-revisionist system. The loans

---

1 V. Vasich, «The Economic Policy of Yugoslavia», Prishtina University Press, 1970.

it has received amount to over 11 billion dollars. From the United States of America alone Yugoslavia has received over 7 billion dollars in credits.

It is not without a purpose that the international bourgeoisie has propped up the Yugoslav «socialist self-administration» system with such a material and financial base. The crutches supplied by Western capital have kept this system on its feet as a model of the preservation of the capitalist order under pseudo-socialist labels.

With their investments, foreign capitalists have built numerous industrial projects in Yugoslavia which turn out products ranging from the highest to the lowest quality. Most of the best products are, of course, sold abroad, and only a fraction of them are marketed within the country. Although there is great capitalist overproduction abroad, and all the markets there are monopolized by the same capitalists who have invested in Yugoslavia, nevertheless, they sell the best Yugoslav goods precisely on these markets for fabulous profits, because labour power in Yugoslavia is cheap, products are turned out at a lower cost in comparison with the capitalist countries, in which the trade-unions, to some extent, play a certain role in pressing the workers' demands against capital. The multinational companies which operate in Yugoslavia, too, get the best products which the factories in Yugoslavia produce. However, on top of the profit they extract in this way, the foreign capitalist investors also squeeze out other profits from the interest on the capital they have invested in Yugoslavia. These profits are often taken in the form of raw material or processed goods.

In his book, the demagogue Kardelj has a

great deal to say about the «self-administration» system, but he maintains total silence about the presence and very major role of foreign capital in keeping the «self-administration» system on its feet.

In the bourgeois countries, says Kardelj, the real power is found and «...manifested, first of all, in the relationships of the State executive power with the political cartels outside Parliament... Parallel with the growth of the prerogatives of the extraparliamentary internal power,» Kardelj continues, «there is a new phenomenon characteristic of contemporary social relations in the highly developed capitalist countries — the creation of the international, or world-wide extraparliamentary power» (p. 54). With this, Kardelj seeks to prove that the Yugoslav «self-administration» has allegedly escaped from such a situation. Whereas, as we explained in the foregoing, the reality presents quite another picture: the Yugoslav «self-administration» is a Yugoslav and foreign capitalist joint administration. The foreign capitalists, that is, the companies, concerns, and those who have made investments in Yugoslavia determine the policy and the all-round development of Yugoslavia just as much as the Yugoslav State power itself.

In fact, the so-called self-administration enterprises, whether big or small, are compelled to take account of the foreign investor. This investor has his own laws, which he has imposed on the Yugoslav State, has his own direct representatives in these joint companies and has his own representatives of influence in the Federation. In fact, directly or indirectly, the investor imposes his will on the Federation, the joint

enterprise or company. This is precisely what «self-administration» is designed to conceal. Such is the camouflage, the *tour de passe-passe** as the French say, which Kardelj has to perform to «prove» the absurdity that Yugoslav «self-administration» is genuine socialism.

But what he endeavours to deny in his book is being proved every day with many facts by the Western press, indeed even by the Yugoslav news agency TANJUG, which, on the 16th of August this year, announced new regulations issued by the Federal Executive *Veche* dealing with foreign investments in Yugoslavia. Under these regulations the rights of foreign capitalist investors in Yugoslavia are extended even further. «Under this law,» the above agency stresses, «the foreign partners, on the basis of the agreements concluded betwen them and the organizations of socialized labour of this country, can make investments in currency, equipment, semi-finished products and technology. Foreign investors have the same rights as the local organizations of socialized labour which invest their means in some other organization of united labour».

Further on TANJUG stresses, «Under this set of regulations greater interest (on the part of foreigners) is anticipated, because it guarantees the security of the joint economic activity on a long-term basis. Besides this, there is now practically no field in which foreigners cannot invest their means, with the exception of social insurance, internal trade and social activities».

The country could not be sold to foreign

* Conjuring trick.

capital more completely than this. And after this purely capitalist reality, the «communist» Kardelj has the temerity to claim, «... our society has assumed a much stronger socio-economic content and structure of its own which arises from the socialist and self-administrative relations of production...» which «... make possible and ensure that our society will develop more and more in a free, independent and self-governing manner...»! (pp. 7-8).

This is the form typical of capitalist enterprises, where in fact it is the capitalist who rules, surrounded by a large number of officials and technicians who know the situation about the production and organize its distribution. Naturally, the bulk of the profits goes to the capitalist who owns the capitalist enterprise, that is, he appropriates the surplus value. Under the Yugoslav «self-administration» a large part of the surplus value is appropriated by the officials, the directors of the enterprises and the engineering--technical staff, while the «lion's share» goes to the Federation or the republic, in order to pay the fat salaries of the horde of officials of the central apparatus, of the Federation or the republic. Funds are needed also to maintain the Titoite dictatorship — the Army, the Ministry of the Interior and the State Security service, the Foreign Ministry, etc., which are in the hands of the Federation and which are constantly inflated and extended. In this Federal State a huge bureaucracy of non-producing officials and leaders, who are paid very high salaries from the sweat and toil of the workers and peasants, has developed. Apart from this, a considerable part of the income is set aside for the foreign capital-

ist who has made investments in these enterprises and has his own representative on the «administrative council», or on the «workers' council», that is, he participates in the leadership of the enterprise. Thus, under this system called «self-administration socialism», the workers find themselves under continuous, total exploitation.

The machinery of the «workers' councils» and «self-administration committees» with their commissions has been devised by the revisionists of Belgrade simply to create the illusion among the workers that by being «elected» to, by taking part and speaking in, these organs, it is allegedly they who decide the affairs of the enterprise, of «their» property. According to Kardelj, «...in the fundamental organization of united labour... the workers run the activity of the organization of united labour and the means of social reproduction..., decide on all the forms of uniting and co-ordinating their own work and means, as well as on all the income they make with their united labour... and divide the income for personal, joint, and general consumption in accord with the basis and criteria laid down — on the basis of self-administration...» (p. 160) etc., etc.

All this is just a tale, because in the conditions when bourgeois democracy is ruling in Yugoslavia, no genuine freedom of thought and action exists there for the workers. The freedom of action in the «self-administration» enterprises is false. In Yugoslavia, the worker does not run things, nor does he enjoy those rights which the «ideologist» Kardelj proclaims so pompously. In order to show that he is a realist and opposed to the injustices of his regime, Tito himself

admitted recently in the speech he delivered at the meeting of leading activists of Slovenia that «self-administration» does not stop those who work badly from increasing their incomes at the expense of those who work well, while the directors of the factories who are to blame for the losses incurred can dodge their responsibility by taking responsible positions in other factories without fear that somebody may reprimand them for these offences they commit.

Although E. Kardelj liquidated the bureaucracy and technocracy, eliminated the role of a dominant technocratic class «in theory», in reality, in practice, this class was rapidly created and found a broad field of activity in this allegedly democratic system, in which the role of the working man is supposedly «decisive». In fact, the role of that stratum of officials and the new bourgeoisie who dominate the «self-administration» enterprise is decisive. It is they who draft the plan, who fix the amount of investments, and everybody's income — the workers' and their own, and, of course, they take good care of themselves. The established laws and rules provide for the leadership to take a greater share of the profits than the workers.

In Yugoslavia, this narrow stratum of people, fattened on the workers' sweat and toil, who take decisions in their own interests, turned into a capitalist class. This is how the political monopoly in decision-making and division of income by the elite in enterprises of socialist «self-administration» was created, while Kardelj continues to harp on the same old tune as if this political system, invented by the Titoites, contributes to the creation of conditions for the ge-

nuine realization of the workers' «self-administration» and the «democratic» rights, which the system recognizes in principle.

The formation of the new capitalist class was encouraged precisely by the system of «self-administration». Tito himself has admitted this bitter fact in a «severe criticism» he allegedly made of the exploiters of workers, all those who run this system of «socialist self-administration» for their own profit. In many speeches, try as he would to hide the evils of his pseudo-socialist system, he has had to admit the existence of the great crisis of this system and the polarization of Yugoslav society into rich and poor. «I do not consider the gains someone makes enrichment, even when he has been able to build a holiday cottage with his profits,» he says. «But when it comes to a matter of hundreds of millions or even billions, then this is theft... This is not wealth gained by the sweat of one's brow... This wealth is being created through speculations of different kinds inside and outside the country... Now we must look into what's being done with those who are building houses, who have one in Zagreb, one in Belgrade, another at the seaside, or some other place. One such person has not simple holiday cottages, but villas he rents out very well. Besides this, they have not just one, but two, or even three cars per family...»(**1**). On another occasion, in order to show that he is against the stratification of society into rich and poor, he has mentioned also that some rich private persons have de-

1 Tito's interview to the editor of the newspaper «Vjestnik». October 1972.

posited about 4.5 billion dollars in the Yugoslav banks alone, without taking account of how much they have deposited in foreign banks and how much they carry in their pockets.

In writing about the system fabricated by the Titoite revisionists, Kardelj is compelled to make passing mention of the need for the fight «...against the various forms of distortions and attempts to usurp the rights of self-government of the workers and citizens» (p. 174). But again he seeks the way out of these «misuses» within the system of «self-administration» by «...extending the respective mechanism of democratic social control...» (p. 178).

Here the question arises: to what class is Kardelj referring when he speaks about the «usurpation of the workers' right to self-government»? Of course, though he does not say so, here he is referring to the old and new bourgeois class which has usurped the power of the working class, and is riding on its back and exploiting it to the bone.

Kardelj tries in vain to present «the workers' councils», «the fundamental organizations of united labour», etc. etc., as the most authentic expression of «democracy» and the «freedom» of man in all social fields. The «workers' councils» are nothing but entirely formal organs, defenders and implementors, not of workers' interests, but of the will of the directors of enterprises, because, being materially, politically and ideologically corrupted, these councils have become part of the «worker aristocracy» and «worker bureaucracy», agencies to mislead and to create false illusions among the working class.

The Yugoslav reality speaks clearly about the lack of genuine democracy for the masses. And it could not be otherwise. Lenin stressed,

> *«'industrial democracy' is a term that lends itself to misinterpretations. It may be read as e repudiation of dictatorship and individual authority. It may be read as a suspension of ordinary democracy or as a means for evading it»(**1**)*

There cannot be socialist democracy for the working class without its State of dictatorship of the proletariat. Marxism-Leninism teaches us that negation of the State of the dictatorship of the proletariat is negation of democracy for the masses of working people.

The negation by the Yugoslav revisionists of the State of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist social property on which it is based has led them to a decentralized management of the economy without a unified State plan. The development of the national economy on the basis of a unified State plan and its management by the socialist State on the basis of the principle of democratic centralism is one of the universal laws and fundamental principles of the construction of socialism in every country. Otherwise capitalism is built, as in Yugoslavia.

Kardelj claims that in their «self-administration» organizations the workers have the right «...to govern the work and the activity of the organization of united labour»... (p. 160), that is, of the enterprises, hence they can also

1 V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 32, p. 80, Alb. ed.

allegedly plan production. But what is the truth? The worker in these organizations neither runs the enterprise nor constructs that so-called plan at the base. These things are done by the new bourgeoisie, the leadership of the enterprise, while the workers are given the impression that the «workers' councils» supposedly make the law in this «self-administration» organization. This happens in the capitalist countries, too, where the power of the private enterprise is in the hands of the capitalist who has his own technocracy, the technocrats who run the enterprise, while in some countries there are also the workers' representatives with a negligible function, just enough to create the illusion among the workers that they, too, allegedly take part in running the affairs of the enterprise. But this is a lie.

The so-called planning which is done in the Yugoslav «self-administration» enterprises cannot be called socialist. On the contrary, being carried out according to the example of all capitalist enterprises, it leads to the same consequences which exist in every capitalist economy, such as anarchy of production, spontaneity, and a series of other contradictions, which manifest themselves in the most overt and savage manner in the Yugoslav economy and market.

«...the free exchange of labour through the production of commodities and the free, self-governing market (emphasis ours) at the present level of the socio-economic development», writes Kardelj, «is a condition tor self-government... This market... is free in the sense that the self-governing organizations of united labour freely and with the minimum administrative in-

tervention, enter into relations of the free exchange of labour. The suspension of such freedom is bound to lead to the regeneration of the State property monopoly of the State apparatus» (p. 95).

There could be no more flagrant denial than this of the teachings of Lenin, who wrote,

> *«We must foster 'proper' trade,* **which is one that does not evade state control», «...for a free market is development of capitalism...»(1)** *(emphasis ours).*

From the political economy of socialism it is known that, under socialism, trade, like all other processes of social reproduction, is a process which is planned and directed in a centralized manner, which is based on the socialist social ownership of the means of production, and itself is a constituent part of the socialist relations of production. However, to the revisionist Kardelj, these teachings are quite alien, and this results from his denial of the economic role of the socialist State and socialist property. The Yugoslav home market is a typical decentralized capitalist market where the means of production are freely sold and purchased by anyone, a thing which is contrary to the laws of socialism. For these reasons TANJUG is forced to admit that entrepreneurs, middlemen and speculators dominate all Yugoslav trade. Chaos, spontaneity, catastrophic fluctuations of prices,

---

1 V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 32, pp. 426, 413, Alb. ed.

etc. prevail in the market. According to data from the Yugoslav Federal Institute of Statistics, prices for 45 main products and social services increased 149.7 per cent in the period from 1972 to 1977 in Yugoslavia.

In regard to sales of commodities inside the country, purchasing power is very weak in Yugoslavia, because of the low wages of the workers, and also because, in the final balance of enterprises, there is not much left to be distributed among the workers. The enterprise wants to sell its products anywhere it can and in an independent manner, because the principal leaders, that is, the bosses, the new bourgeoisie, want to create profits. But where can they create the profits they want when the buyer is poor? Therefore, they have contrived new forms, one of which is the sale of goods on time payment. The selling of goods turned out in these «self-administration» enterprises on time payment is another chain around the necks of the Yugoslav workers, just as the workers of the capitalist countries are chained by the same capitalist system, which, in Yugoslavia, is called «socialist self-administration».

Similar features also characterize Yugoslav foreign trade in which no State monopoly exists. Depending on the wishes of its owners, every enterprise can conclude contracts and agreements with any firm, multinational company or foreign State to buy or sell raw materials and machinery, finished products, technological means, etc. This anti-Marxist policy, also, has had its influence on the Yugoslav State becoming a vassal of world capital, on its deep involvement in the economic and financial crisis which has

the entire capitalist-revisionist world in its grip, a crisis which is also manifested in other fields.

As a die-hard revisionist, E. Kardelj also denies the role of the socialist State in other fields, such as financial relations and other activities of various character. He writes, «Relations in the fields on which the self-governing communities of interest are founded, are realized according to regulations, without the intervention of the State, that is, ...without the intermediary of the budget and other administrative-fiscal measures...» (p. 167).

In Yugoslavia, just as in the other capitalist countries, the system of the provision of credits by the banks instead of the budgetary financing of investments for the development of the productive forces and other activities, has assumed very wide-spread proportions. The banks have become centres of financial capital, and it is precisely these that play a very important role in the Yugoslav economy in the interests of the new revisionist bourgeoisie.

Thus, an anarcho-syndicalist system has been established in Yugoslavia, and this has been named «socialist self-administration». What has this «socialist self-administration» brought to Yugoslavia? Every kind of evil. Anarchy in production in the first place. Nothing is stable there. Each enterprise throws its products on the market and capitalist competition takes place, because there is no co-ordination, since it is not the socialist economy which guides production. Each enterprise goes it alone, competing against the other, in order to ensure raw materials, markets and everything else. Many enterprises are closing down because of lack of raw materials, the huge

deficits created by this chaotic capitalist development, the build-up of stocks of unsold goods due to the lack of purchasing power and the saturation of the market with outdated goods. Yugoslavia's handicrafts services are in a very serious state. Referring to this problem at the meeting of Slovenia's leading activists, Tito could not hide the fact that «Today you have to sweat a good deal to find, for example, a joiner or some other craftsman to repair something for you, and even when you find him, you are fleeced so blatantly that it makes your hair stand on end».

Regardless of the previously mentioned fact that some of the modern combines turn out good quality products, a difficult situation is created for Yugoslavia because it has to find a market for the sale of these commodities. Because of these difficulties Yugoslavia's balance of foreign trade is passive. In just the first 5 months of this year the deficit was 2 billion dollars. At the 11th Congress of the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia, Tito declared, «the deficit with the Western market has become almost intolerable». Nearly three months after this congress, he declared again in Slovenia, «We have especially great difficulties in trade exchanges with the European Common Market member countries. There the imbalance to our disadvantage is very great and constantly increasing. We must talk with them very seriously about this. Many of them promise us that these things will be put in order, that imports from Yugoslavia will increase, but up to now we have had very little benefit from all this. Each is putting the blame on the other». And the deficit in foreign trade, which Tito does not mention in this speech of his, exceeded 4 bil-

lion dollars in 1977. This is a catastrophe for Yugoslavia.

The entire country is in the grip of an unending crisis, and the broad working masses live in poverty. Hundreds of thousands of Yugoslav workers are out of work, are being thrown into the street or emigrating abroad. Tito has not only acknowledged this economic emigration, this capitalist phenomenon, but has even recommended that is should be developed. Unemployment cannot exist in a socialist country and the clearest example in this direction is Albania. Meanwhile in the capitalist countries, among which Yugoslavia is, of course, included, unemployment exists and is developing everywhere. When Yugoslavia has over one million unemployed, and over 1.3 million economic emigrants are selling their labour power in Federal Germany, Belgium, France, etc., when the wealth of individuals occupying important posts either in the State administration or in enterprises and institutions is increasing rapidly, when the prices of consumer goods are mounting day by day, when the bankrupt enterprises and branches number thousands, the system of Yugoslav «self-administration» is proved to be a great fraud. And yet Kardelj has the temerity to write, «in our conditions, socialist self-administration is the most direct form and expression of the struggle for the freedom of the working man, for the freedom of his labour and creativeness, for his decisive economic and political influence in society» (p. 158).

Going ever further in his bourgeois-type demagogy of stale phrases, Kardelj reaches such depth of deception as to say, «With the Consti-

tutional and legal guarantee of the workers' rights on the basis of their socialized labour in the past, our society further extends the dimensions of real freedom for the workers and working people in the material relations of society» (p. 162). And what does this apologist of the bourgeoisie have in mind when he talks of the extension of the «dimensions of true freedom» for the workers? Is it the «freedom» to be unemployed, the «freedom» to leave their families and homeland in order to sell the power of their muscles and minds to the capitalists of the Western world, or is it the «freedom» to pay taxes, to be discriminated against and savagely exploited by the old and the new Yugoslav bourgeoisie, as well as by the foreign bourgeoisie?

3. - «Self-administration» and the Anarchist Views on the State
The National Question in Yugoslavia

In Yugoslavia organs of State power as genuine representatives of the people do not exist. There is only the bureaucratic system called «the system of delegates», which is presented as the alleged bearer of the system of State power, and that is why no elections for deputies to the organs of State power are held. The Titoites want to justify this fact by arguing that the representative organs are allegedly expressions of bourgeois parliamentarism and of the Soviet socialist State which, according to them, Stalin had allegedly turned into an institution of bureaucracy and technocracy. The experience of the Soviets of the worker and peasant deputies, set up by Lenin

on the basis of the great experience of the Paris Commune, has been cancelled in Yugoslavia, because they have been described by the Yugoslav revisionists as «forms of State organization which create personal power».

Elaborating the revisionist idea of «specific socialism», around the '50s, the Titoites proclaimed world-wide that they had definitively rejected the socialist State system and replaced it with some kind of a new system, «self-administrative socialism», in which socialism and the State are alien to each other. This revisionist «discovery» was nothing but a copy of the anarchist theories of Proudhon and Bakunin on «workers' self-administration» and «workers' factories», which have long been exposed, as well as a gross falsification of the real ideas of Marx and Lenin on the State of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Karl Marx wrote:

> «*Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period, in which the State can be nothing but the* **revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat**». **(1)**

The political system of «socialist self-administration» in Yugoslavia has nothing in common with the dictatorship of the proletariat, but is opposed to it. This system has been built on the model of the administration of the United States of

---

1 K. Marx - F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. 2, p. 23, Tirana 1975, Alb. ed.

America. Talking about the Yugoslav system of «self-administration», Kardelj himself has written, «...we may say that this system is a little more akin to the organization of the executive power in the United States of America than to that of Western Europe...» (p. 235).

Consequently, it is clear that here there is no denial of the fact that the organization of the Yugoslav government is a copy of the organization of capitalist governments, but what may be discussed is the question: which capitalist government has been imitated more closely, the American government or one of the governments of Western Europe? And Kardelj gives the answer to this question, when he says: the organization of the executive power of the United States of America has been taken as a model.

The Yugoslav revisionists' views of the State are completely anarchist. It is known that anarchism calls for the immediate abolition of any kind of State, hence of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Yugoslav revisionists have abolished the dictatorship of the proletariat and, in order to justify this betrayal, they talk about two phases of socialism: «State socialism» and «true humanitarian socialism». The initial phase, according to them, covers the first years following the triumph of the revolution, when the dictatorship of the proletariat exists, and is expressed in the «etatist-bureaucratic» State, the same as in capitalism. The second phase is that of going beyond the «etatist-bureaucratic» State and its replacement with «direct democracy». With these views the Titoites not only deny the need for the dictatorship of the proletariat in socialism, but also counterpose to one another the notions

of socialist State, dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist democracy.

They disregard the teachings of the classics of Marxism-Leninism that during the whole historical period of the transition from capitalism to communism the socialist State is constantly strengthened. That is why E. Kardelj writes that society in Yugoslavia is based less and less on the role of the State apparatus. According to him, the State is allegedly disappearing in Yugoslavia at the present time.

But with what does Kardelj replace the role of the State apparatus? He replaces it with «the workers' initiative»! He puts it like this, «...the further functioning of our society will be based less and less on the role of the State apparatus, and more and more on the power and initiative of the workers...» (p. 8). What absurd reasoning! For one to speak about the initiative of the workers, in the first place the workers must be free and organized, they must be inspired by clear-cut directives, and effective measures must be taken for the implementation of these initiatives. In Yugoslavia, who is engaged in the organization of the workers and their inspiration with clear-cut directives? The «self-administrative community», says E. Kardelj, reasoning in an abstract manner. He leaves the main role in this kind of community to the individual «in the united self-administrative work for his own interests». As to what is meant by this «self-administrative community» of individual interests which is placed at the centre of Yugoslav society, nothing at all is explained, but what is most striking in these ideas is bourgeois individualism, which exalts the absolute rights of the individual in society and

his complete independence from society, the putting of personal interests above the interests of society.

According to this «theoretician» who permits himself such judgement, the strengthening of the State and its apparatus is characteristic of the «State-owned forms of socialist relations of production...» (p. 8), whereas in Yugoslavia, says he, the process of the strengthening of the «self-administrative» role of the working man will develop more in place of the State. Hence, in a true socialist State where Marxist-Leninist science and the Leninist revolutionary practice are applied, according to this «philosopher», man cannot be free and master of his fate, but is transformed into an automaton, whereas under Yugoslav «self-administration» the working man allegedly assumes great importance, and precisely in this «self-administration», in «the democratic mechanism of delegation of Yugoslav society», he allegedly understands his great role! Which classes these State organs represent, what ideology guides them, on what principles have they built their activity and to what forum do they render account? Of course all these questions remain without clear answer, because any accurate answer to them would shed light on Yugoslavia's capitalist political system.

Making no distinction at all as to what State, party or system he is referring to, and attacking the State in general for being inhuman, Kardelj sticks to his anarchist positions, when he writes, «Neither the State, nor the system, nor the political party can bring happiness to man. Man alone can bring happiness to himself» (p. 8).

This is quite clear evidence of the tendencies to spontaneity in the anti-Marxist theory of «socialist self-administration», according to which the working class need not organize itself in the party or the State to achieve its aspirations, because with the passage of time, even while wandering in the dark, one day it will find the happiness it is seeking.

To anticipate the question: since the State is allegedly unnecessary, why is it not eliminated in Yugoslavia? Kardeli writes, «The State... must interpose in the role of the arbiter only in those instances when the self-governing agreement cannot be achieved, while from the aspect of social interests, it is essential that a decision be taken» (p. 23). And to prove that allegedly the need for State arbitration to settle disagreements is seldom felt, he says, «The free exchange of labour has an essential influence on reducing antagonisms between physical and mental work. In relations of this kind, mental work is no longer superior to physical work, but is only one of the components of the free united labour and of the free exchange of different forms of the results of labour» (p. 24). Upon reading these phrases, the question arises in everybody's mind: can it be the Yugoslav social order the author is referring to? Whenever were antagonisms between mental and physical work in Yugoslavia so reduced?!

The reality of developments in Yugoslavia proves the opposite. Between mental and physical work there are essential distinctions which cannot be reduced by words alone. It is astonishing that there should be talk about the reduction of antagonisms between mental and

physical work in the Yugoslav State when it is known that there the differentials between workers' wages and intellectuals' salaries, alone, without mentioning other distinctions, have reached a ratio of one to twenty, if not more.

Kardelj considers «self-administration in the united work» as «...the genuine material basis for self-administration in society, too, that is to say, in the socio-political communities which exercise State power from the commune up to the Federation, as well as for the realization of the democratic rights of working people and citizens in the running of the State, or society respectively. Self-government is the material basis, also, for the development of the worker as a creative individual in the utilization of all sorts of social means...» (p. 24), and many other such phrases.

Seeking to present the so-called self-administration as the material premise for man's happiness which has allegedly been discovered by the great brains of Yugoslavia, Kardelj resorts to twisted phrases and ecclesiastical language, preaching a long sermon and saying nothing. He lines up contradictory ideas about «scientific socialism», and uses lengthy expressions in order to give his words the appearance of an allegedly profound philosophical meaning.

But how is the Yugoslav political system working out in practice? When it comes to answering this question, Kardelj is forced to admit: «In this respect, the system itself has too many weak points. A whole series of weaknesses in the functioning of the organizations and institutions of our political system quite naturally creates the belief that powerful sources of bureacuracy and technocracy are still operating, that our admi-

nistration is complicated and that is why bureaucracy is rampant, that some organs and organizations are closed in on themselves, that there are many gaps and cases of duplication of work, that the forms of democratic communication between self-government and State organs ond the entire social structure are weakly developed, that we hold many useless and improductive meetings, that the meetings and decisions are frequently insufficiently prepared from the professional viewpoint, that in the fight for his rights the citizen often has difficulties in overcoming administrative obstacles etc.» (p. 193). When the «self-administration» system has been overwhelmed by bureaucracy, whien the State and administrative organs are closed in on themselves, take worthless decisions and shut out the citizens who want them to do something about their many troubles, then who, apart from the Tito clique, needs this system? How can the Yugoslav citizens govern themselves when they cannot overcome the «administrative obstacles»? Despite all the great desire of the devil not to show his cloven foot, despite all the reservations and efforts to round things off by the Titoite ideologist in order to cover up the ills of his system, still even from what he admits, the truth leaks out.

Kardelj writes, «Both the structure of delegates' assemblies and the way decisions are taken in them are so organized that, in principle, they ensure the leading role of the united labour in the whole system of taking State decisions» (pp. 24-25). There he is juggling with words in order to show that the «delegates' assemblies», which in reality are like the assem-

blies set up by capitalist trade-unions, where the trade-union members indulge in idle talk, can allegedly exercise State functions. Therefore, according to him, the State of the dictatorship of the proletariat is superfluous.

Here, of course, it is not just a matter of replacing the name of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which terrifies the bourgeoisie and the revisionists, with another name — «delegates' assemblies». No, the question here is about the change in the class character of the socialist State, so that not the working class, but the new bourgeoisie, has power. It is not difficult to see that the aim of these stands is to justify the course of returning to capitalism, and as far as possible, the Titoite betrayal.

In order to present their notorious system of «socialist self-administration» as fair and acceptable, the Titoites oppose it to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Making no distinction between capitalism and socialism, the Titoites consider all other political systems «dogmatic». After calling their dreams the «socialist system of self-administration», in order to demonstrate the superiority of their system, they compare it with the capitalist social order.

Of course, the Yugoslav revisionists cannot fail to «find fault» with the parliamentary political system of bourgeois society, which Kardelj defines as a system of «many parties», for otherwise they would be exposing themselves as advocates of bourgeois parliamentarism, which Marx and Lenin sternly critized in their time. Therefore, they declare that it is a mistake to consider this political form of the bourgeois State as having

a universal and eternal character. It is common knowledge that Kardelj was not the first to «criticize» the capitalist ideologists' notorious thesis on the universal and eternal character of capitalism. Refuting the views of social-democracy, the classics of Marxism-Leninism have proved scientifically that the capitalist system is by no means of a universal and eternal character, that it is doomed to extinction, that the capitalist State, which is the offspring and bulwark of this anti-popular system, must be destroyed to its foundations and instead a true socialist system must be established, but not a bastardized system which starts from capitalism and returns again to capitalism, as the Yugoslav political system of «self-administration» does.

Kardelj «criticizes» the bourgeois parliamentary system, but lightly and gently, because it hurts him to do so, therefore immediately after criticizing it, he lauds to the skies and makes a fetish of its contribution to the democratic development of mankind. In order to magnify this contribution to such an extent that the reactionary character of today's bourgeois parliament pales into insignificance and, in particular, to show the «organic link between parliamentarism and man's democratic rights», for the first time he quotes (or rather misquotes) Marx: «The parliamentary regime lives on debate — then how can it ban discussion? Every social interest and institution is transformed here into general ideas, and it is as such that they are thrashed out — how is it possible, then, for any interest or institution to stand above all ideas and impose itself like a religious dogma?... A parliamentary regime allows the majority to decide everything —

how is it possible then, that the overwhelming majority outside parliament can fail to want to take decisions?»

This quotation from Marx is like a square peg in a round hole in the context of this book, therefore it can hardly serve to prove what Kardelj wants. Marx's idea, out of context and impermissibly mutilated, in the tricky way it was quoted by this revisionist, casts doubt on the undeniable fact that Marx was absolutely opposed to the venal and rotten parliamentarism of the bourgeoisie.

This is an abortive attempt on the author's part because Marx's stand is publicly known. In criticizing the bourgeois parliament and the bourgeois theory of the division of powers, Marx never said that representative institutions should be done away with and the principle of elections abandoned, as was done in Yugoslavia, but he wrote that in the proletarian State such representative organs should be set up and operate that are not «talking shops, but real working institutions, built and acting as

> *«...a working body, executive and legislative, at the same time». (**1**)*

Bourgeois parliamentarism has gained «great strength», because, according to the author of the book, socialist practice, with the exception of Yugoslavia, has allegedly been unable to develop new forms of democratic life corresponding to socialist relations of production more rapidly

1 K. Marx - F. Engels, Selected works, vol. 2, p. 544, Tirana 1975, Alb. ed.

and extensively. The new form of democratic life, according to Kardelj, has allegedly been realized under «socialist self-administration» which has crossed the Rubicon of the class State power of the technocratic monopoly owners and managers of capital. It is surprising that he should describe all the efforts of the democratic forces to find forms of democracy as «artificial constructions» of the bourgeois Parliament, as attempts to unite «several things that cannot be united», whereas he calls the constructions of Yugoslavia's «socialist self-administration», these bastardized grafts on the bourgeois-revisionist forms of government, original and socialist! If ever there was fraud in the construction of the government it is to be found, in the first place, in the «self-administration», concocted according to the anti-Marxist and anti-democratic theory of the Titoites. Regardless of the numerous deceptive statements made about it, Yugoslav «self-administration» is a copy of bourgeois parliamentarism and of capitalist relations of production; it is a chaotic appendage of the world capitalist system, of the structure and superstructure of this system.

«Our socialist democracy,» writes Kardelj, «would not be an all-embracing system of democratic relations without the relevant solution of the problems of relations among Yugoslavia's nations and nationalities» (p. 171). Although it was the occasion for the revisionist ideologist to explain how the political system of «socialist self-administration» has solved the problem of nations and nationalities in Yugoslavia, he has skirted so widely around this major problem, so serious and delicate for his Federation, that after

reading his book of 323 pages, one can barely recall that it made any mention of nations and nationalities.

How does the problem of nations and nationalities in Yugoslavia stand? The Yugoslav Federation inherited deep-rooted conflicts in this field. The policy of the Great-Serbian Kings and reactionary chauvinistic circles in Yugoslavia was such that, historically, it stirred up conflicts and enmity among nations and nationalities.

After the Second World War, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia launched the slogan of «unity-fraternity», but this slogan proved quite inadequate to solve the differences inherited from the past, therefore the old conflicts, the savage craving for domination over others did not disappear.

Tito and the renegade clique around him did not carry out a Marxist-Leninist national policy in regard to the tendencies of republics and regions to break away from the Federation. On the contrary, the relations among nationalities remained the same as in the time of the Kings, and in regard to some nationalities the genocide went on as before. This policy served to fuel the hatred and quarrels among the nations and nationalities of Yugoslavia. The «unity» and «fraternity» of peoples about which there is a great deal of talk in Yugoslavia, has never been presented on the just basis of the economic, political, social and cultural equality of nations and nationalities.

Without achieving equality in these fields the national question in Yugoslavia cannot be solved correctly. For three decades now, apart from its demagogy about the «self-governing community of nations and nationalities of a new

type», the «self-administrative socialism» has done nothing about the implementation of the sovereign rights of these different nations and nationalities in the republics and regions of Yugoslavia. For example, the Kosova region, with an Albanian population almost three times greater than the population of the Republic of Montenegro, has a marked economic, political, social and cultural backwardness, in comparison with the other regions of Yugoslavia. In the larger Republics, too, as compared with the other Republics, impermissible distinctions exist in all fields of life. This situation is the weakest spot which is shaking the Federation of the Yugoslav revisionists to its foundations. Pious hopes about the solution to the old and new differences among Yugoslavia's nations are devoid of prospect.

From an objective and scientific analysis of this very difficult and troubled situation, the incontestable conclusion emerges that the national question in Yugoslavia will not be solved unless Marxism-Leninism is implemented there, that is to say, unless the so-called self-administrative capitalist order is overthrown.

The Titoite renegades are aware of this danger, therefore when they have to mention the problems of nations and nationalities, they try to skate over it with pompous statements, without getting to the crux of the problems, or by seeking false testimony from other revisionists, as they did when they gave great publicity to the declarations of the Chinese revisionists about the «Marxist-Leninist solution of the national problem in Yugoslavia».

In words, the revisionists may present the

relations among the nations and nationalities of Yugoslavia as they like, but they will still be terrified of the bitter truth of this problem when they are in their graves.

The national question in Yugoslavia will be solved by the peoples of the present Federation, and not by those who, regardless of what they say, in fact are still pursuing the reactionary, chauvinistisc policy of their predecessors.

Continuing to deliver his judgements, speaking about the policy of the Yugoslav State, the inveterate revisionist Kardelj says, «...this policy is no longer the monopoly of professional politicians and the political cartels behind the scenes, but instead it becomes a matter of the direct activity and taking of decisions by the self-governors and their organs...» (p. 25). There! says Kardelj, henceforth do not critize us for betraying the interests of the working class because the Yugoslav worker is master of the policy of the country and of the defence of his «self-administrative» interests, unlike in the other States where professional politicians are the masters. And here, too, with evil intent, he does not differentiate between capitalist and socialist countries, but lumps them all together in the same bag because in this manner it is easier to present black as white.

He knows that in order to further the dishonest objectives he has in mind, the manifestations which expose the «self-administrative» reality must be minimized in every way. Therefore, he belittles the fact that the Yugoslav worker has no possibility of exercizing his rights in the political and economic field, and explains that this «is due to a series of objective and subjective

reasons, among which, undoubtedly, is the relatively still low level of education and culture, and the level of the application of science — the worker is not yet able to master, orientate, or completely control, in a conscious and creative manner, all the the processes which this socio-economic position imposes on him» (p. 27).

Obviously this is written in an effort to defend anti-worker and anti-socialist standpoints. At present the Yugoslav worker understands nothing of this illusory theory, and does not see any of these false and absurd ideas which are unacceptable to him, being implemented in practice.

Since the low cultural and scientific level of the workers is an obstacle, as Kardeij says, the main role in the «self-administrative» society is played by the educated and skilled people, who are the elite ruling in the «socialist community». Under these circumstances, in most instances, decisions will be taken precisely by this elite, by the cultured element of the new bourgeoisie which makes the law in Yugoslavia. Who is to blame that the elite is becoming prominent and the role of the workers diminishing? There is no doubt the blame lies with the very social system which generates the new capitalist class and provides it with the possibilities to strengthen itself economically at the expense of the workers and become educated, while the working class is left at a low level. Kardelj cannot deny the fact that, in practice, decisions are taken by a relatively narrow stratum of people in Yugoslavia. However, he has nothing to say about the fact that this is precisely how the political monopoly of the elite in taking decisions and in the

division of the income in the enterprises of «socialist self-administration» is created. This political monopoly, which the Yugoslav revisionists allegedly guard against and combat, is deep-rooted in their so-called political system of «socialist self-administration».

In the «self-administrative» society, as Kardelj expresses it, «...instead of the old relationships: the worker — the State — social activities, a new relationship must inevitably be constituted between the workers engaged directly in production and the workers in social activities» (p. 23). According to him, the correct way to build social relations is not that followed by a socialist regime where scientific socialism is applied, where there is unity between the workers directly involved in production and the workers engaged in social activities, where there is vigorous socio-political activity and an organization of the economy in which the principal role is played by the working people organized in their socialist State. The correct way, according to Kardelj, is that of building «new» social relations without the participation of the State!

These ideas are expressions of pure anarchism. All these phrases are poured out to obscure every advantage a genuine socialist regime offers, and to make people believe that in Yugoslavia they are allegedly marching towards the unity of the workers and intellectuals through the «free exchange of labour», which reduces their antagonism as if by magic.

In Kardelj's «theory» there is not, nor can there be, any mention of the violent overthrow of the capitalist State, the seizure of power by the working class and the establishment of the

dictatorship of the proletariat. Although he quotes Marx's words, «violence is precisely what we are obliged to use at the given moment, i.e., in order to give definitive legal sanction to the power of labour», he does this only to prove that Marx allegedly leaned more towards the triumph of the proletarian revolution by peaceful means, while considering violence an exception and making it conditional on some particular social circumstances. And with such sophistry, Kardelj seeks to create the impression that the working class nowadays can achieve its historical interests not through the revolution, but in alliance with the various political parties of the capitalist countries. Kardej has cunningly copied this quotation to pit Marx against Marx in regard to the possibility of the peaceful transition to socialism, from his revisionist predecessors, against whom Lenin wrote,

> *«The reference to what Marx... said about the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism... is completely fallacious, or, to put it bluntly, dishonest, in that it is juggling with quotations and references.» (**1**)*

Kardelj needs these falsifications in order to lend a hand to the «Eurocommunists», with whom he is in complete accord. The Italian, French and Spanish revisionist parties have declared that they will allegedly achieve socialism through the development of bourgeois democracy and freedoms, through the force of number of votes in parliamentary elections. Accord-

1 V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 28, p. 107, Alb. ed.

ing to the «Eurocommunists», the ability of the working class will be expressed in to what extent it it will gain the key positions in the structure of capitalist society and the State, as well as in the running of society. According to them, the transformation of the character of the relations of production from capitalist to «self-administrative», or «socialist», will become possible in this way. It is precisely on this issue that the Titoite theory and the theory of «Eurocommunism» are united. The «Eurocommunists» are obliged to accept European bourgeois political pluralism and unity among bourgeois parties in order allegedly to be able to ensure many rights for the working class through reforms, and then go over to «socialist» society in this way. These aspirations of his friends Kardelj describes as «structural changes», «which, without fail, must exert such an influence that the process develops and transforms both the position and role of the parliament itself.

Kardelj's theory claims that, in the crisis of the capitalist system, the «communist parties of Western Europe, while preserving the parliamentary system, whose democratic achievements, he says, cannot be denied, must find an appropriate way to secure for the working class an alliance with the broadest «democratic» forces. Through this sort of alliance, according to revisionist logic, a more favourable «democratic» situation can be created in the parliamentary system and, in the long run, the parliamentary system will be «transformed», though nobody knows how, into a decisive power of the people! This is the course Titoism sets for the other revisionist parties to come to power on the peaceful road.

In the bourgeois States, however, power is in

the hands of the capitalists, the national businesses and cartels and multinational companies. These forces of capital have the main keys to the management of the economy and the State firmly in their hands, they make the law and, through a fraudulent democratic process, appoint the government, which is under their orders and is presented as an official administrator of their assets. The bourgeoisie does not safeguard its power in order to hand it over to the «Eurocommunists», but in order to protect its class interests, even with bloodshed, if need be. To fail to see this reality, which life is confirming every day, means to close your eyes and indulge in day-dreaming. If the «Eurocommunists» do indeed succeed in gaining one or more positions in the bourgeois government, in reality they will go there as representatives of capitalism, just like the other bourgeois political parties, and not as representatives of the proletariat.

The bourgeois pseudo-democracy, the Parliament which allegedly chooses the government, is nothing but a puppet in the hands of the power of capital which operates «behind the scenes» and, in various forms, dictates everything from outside. The various parties represented in Parliament, as well as the trade-unions which allegedly fight to defend the workers, give various nuances to these different forms of the real power exercised «behind the scenes». In reality, all the bourgeois-revisionist parties and trade-unions in the capitalist State, regardless of the names they assume, are dependent on the owning class.

Kardelj says the «Eurocommunists» are right when they link their political struggle for «socialism» with defence of the institutions of pluralism

of political forces, because, as he puts it, «...in the present situation of the countries of Western Europe, this is the only realistic road to the unity of the forces of the working class itself, as well as to linking it with the other people's democratic forces, this is the only thing which can essentially strengthen the social and political positions of the working class, i.e., make it capable of changing society, and not just of criticizing it» (p. 41).

Speaking about the links, solidarity and unity of the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia with the «Eurocommunists» and all the other revisionist parties which, in one way or another, in this or that form, defend capitalism and fight the revolution and true socialism. Kardelj says, «...We have reason to defend the parliamentary system and political pluralism when the reactionary forces of bourgeois society attack it...» (p. 61). This «ideologist» wants to say that the working class and the pseudo-communists of Western Europe are right to unite with the capitalist institutions, Parliament and the bourgeois government, because through this union and only in this way will the working class become capable of changing society!

From the foregoing it comes out clearly that the Yugoslav «self-administrative» society is for the close alliance or fusion of capitalism and socialism, because the present-day capitalists allegedly have no objection to the building of a new society in which the working class will gain the ability to fully assume its democratic «self-administrative» rights. Hence it is not difficult to see that the author of the book recommends that there must be a transition from the «consumer

society», in which the technocrats have allegedly seized power, to a «self-administrative» society in which the individuals are associated in «common labour», and this transition can ce called a triumph of socialism! There is nothing resembling genuine scientific socialism in these judgements and stands of inveterate renegades. As loyal servants of the capitalist bourgeoisie, the Titoites deny the proletarian revolution and the class struggle with these things they are writing. In claiming that the «consumer society» can be transformed into socialism gradually, without violent revolution, but by virtue of the «Holy Spirit», they seek to disarm the proletariat and smash its Marxist-Leninist Party.

In the capitalist countries, «reveals» Kardelj, the executive power is linked with political forces which act and impose their policy from outside Parliament. Here, again Kardelj is saying nothing new, but simply repeating as his own observation that idea which Lenin expressed in his masterful exposure of the falsity of the bourgeois democracy. It is a fine thing to assimilate and repeat Lenin's ideas, but it is neither Lenin nor Leninism that concerns Mr. Kardelj. He is also afraid of the «politicism» and the «political monopoly of Leninism, although it pleases him «to politicize» others and make them believe that under capitalism the executive power is really manipulated by forces outside the State organs, whereas in Yugoslavia, the Presidency of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Federal Executive Council which constitutes the government, have miraculously escaped this danger because they have allegedly divided their competences «in a precise manner» (p. 235). Apart

from this, in Yugoslavia still according to Kardelj, the political strength is concentrated in «...the delegates' assembly, and moreover, not just in this but in its interconnection with the whole social structure» (p. 235). In regard to its «full powers and authority», this «delegates' assembly» is reminiscent of the so-called councils of local self-government in the bourgeois countries, which Lenin, has ridiculed, saying that they

> *«...may be 'autonomous' only in minor matters, may be independent only in tinkerin with wash-basins» (**1**).*

It is said that under «workers' self-administration», the «delegates» voice their opinions freely. Of course, in theory, not only the «delegates», but also the workers have all rights, but in practice they enjoy none. In the political system of Yugoslav «self-government» everything is decided from above, and not from below. The protests of the Yugoslav workers against the enrichment and corruption of leading officials, their coming out with demands for the elimination of economic and social distinctions, the abolition of private enterprises, checking political and moral corruption, protests against national discrimination etc., are already well-known. The book is full of very long phrases which, by wearyig the reader, are intended to make him believe the abstract idea that «socialist self-government exists in Yugoslavia», that «workers' self-administration reigns» there, at a time when the only keys the workers hold will open no doors. The keys to the govern-

1 V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 10, p. 366, Alb. ed.

ment of the country are held by the new Yugoslav bourgeoisie which operates from rightist positions, while disguising itself with leftist slogans.

4. - The System of «Self-administration» and the Negation of the Leading Role of the Party

The Yugoslav revisionists also maintain an anti-Marxist stand towards the leading role of the communist party in the construction of socialism. According to Kardelj's «theory», the party must lead no economic or administrative activity. It can and should exercise its influence only through its educational activity among the workers, so that they understand the socialist system well.

The negation of the role of the communist party in the construction of socialism and the reduction of this role to an «ideological» and «orientating» factor is in open opposition to Marxism-Leninism. The enemies of scientific socialism substantiate this thesis by «arguing» that leadership by the party is allegedly incompatible with the decisive role which should be played by the masses of producers, who, they claim, should exercise their political influence directly, and not through the communist party, because this would bring about «bureaucratic despotism»!

Contrary to the anti-scientific theses of these enemies of communism, historical experience has shown that the undivided leading role of the revolutionary party of the working class in the struggle for socialism and communism is absolutely essential. As is known, leadership by the party is a question of vital importance for the fate of the revolution, and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It reflects a universal law of the socialist revolution. Lenin says,

> *«...the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be realized except through the Communist Party» (**1**).*

The direct political influence of the working masses in socialist society is not in any way hampered by the communist party which represents the working class, whose interests do not run counter to the interests of the other working people. On the contrary, it is only under the leadership of the working class and its vanguard that the working masses participate broadly in governing the country and realizing their interests. In a genuinely socialist country, such as Albania, the opinion of the working masses on important problems is directly solicited. There are countless examples of this from the discussion and approval of the Constitution to the drafting of economic plans, etc., etc. «Bureaucratic despotism» is a characteristic of the capitalist State, and it can never be attributed to the leading role of the party under the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which from its nature and class character, is sternly anti-bureaucratic.

Continuing the exposition of his revisionist views on the role of the party, Kardelj writes, that, although it must fight for the key positions of State power to be in the hands of those subjectivist forces which are on the side of socialism and socialist self-administration, the League of «Communists» «...cannot be a class political party»

---

1 V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 32, p. 226, Alb. ed.

(p. 119). So that is the sort of the party the Yugoslav revisionists want! They do not want, and in reality do not have, a political party of the working class, but a bourgeois organization, a club which anybody may enter or leave, when and how it pleases him, provided only he declares he is a «communist» without needing to be such. Of course, this is quite normal for such a party as the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia, which has nothing communist about it.

There has never been a classless party or State, nor there will ever be. Parties and the States are class products. That is how they came into existence and how they will be right up to communism.

Although Kardelj imagines that the leading role of the League of «Communists» has been liquidated, still, for demagogical purposes, he does not forget to say that this League, «with its clear stands (which in fact are far from being clear but on the contrary murky and turbid) must do a great deal to find means to solve many problems about the ways and forms for the further development of the political system of socialist self-administration». If the happiness for the people cannot come from the State, or the party, as the renegade Kardelj writes, then why does he seek that these prerogatives be given to the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia? If, as is claimed, the Yugoslav society of «self-administration» has no need for the leadership of a single political party, why then, should it need the leadership of the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia?

Whereas Marx stands for a genuine party of the working class, which must lead this class

and make it conscious of its historic mission, according to Kardelj, the proletariat can carry the country forward and realize its aspirations in a spontaneous manner, even without the leading role of the party. He says this in order to justify the theory of «self-administration», a theory which also stands for political pluralism, that is, for the unity in the so-called Socialist League of Working People of all social forces, regardless of their ideo-political differences, and for a party which has no communist value at all, but to which he attaches the label of leader in the whole anti-Marxist system of «self-administration».

The revisionist Kardelj refers to the bureaucracy of the Western parties of capital. Here, too, he has discovered nothing new, because it is well known that bureaucracy is part of the nature of capitalism and characteristic of it. But he denounces bureaucracy in other parties not in order to criticize them, but to hide the bureaucratization and then the liquidation of the Yugoslav communist party and the stripping of it of all prerogatives that belonged to it. The Titoites call the displacement of the party to the tail-end of events, phenomena, or processes of political and social life and its transformation into a party of the bourgeoisie, de-bureaucratization and, in order to cover up their betrayal, they have left it flaunting the name the «League of Communists of Yugoslavia».

Whether or not a party is communist, whether or not it is a party of the working class, cannot be judged from the name it bears, but especially from whom it has as its leadership and what activity it carries out. Lenin said,

*«... whether or not a party is really a political party of the workers depends... also upon the men that lead it, and the content of its actions and its political tactics». (**1**)*

And in fact, not only has the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia not been rescued from bureaucracy, but it has long since ceased to exist as the party of the Yugoslav communists. Its inflation with numerous apparatuses, a great number of bureaucratic salaried officials just like the Western revisionist parties or the social-democratic parties, is one among the factors which have brought about that it is no longer the vanguard of the working class, but a party fighting the working class.

Rule by the working class and its vanguard party as the leader of the State and society does not exist in Yugoslavia. According to Kardelj, it turns out that in Yugoslavia the League of «Communists» has no rights at all to political leadership in the State system, for power there is exercised «...through the system of delegation», while the League of «Communists», as part of the self-administrative system, is one of the most important factors of social influence in the formation of the consciousness of self-administrators and the organs of delegates» (p. 73). I think there is no need for further explanation. What this renegade writes is enough to convince us that the dictatorship of the proletariat, as the political rule by the working class and State leadership of society by this class, does not exist

1 V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol., 31, p. 285, Alb. ed.

in Yugoslavia. And since this dictatorship does not exist there, we cannot speak of the existence of the party of the working class, either, but only of a party of the bourgeoisie.

Kardelj pretends that «the one-party system» in a socialist country is a specific transformation of the bourgeois political system, and the role of the one party (here he implies the Bolshevik Party) is the same as that of «the multi-party system», of bourgeois political pluralism with one «minor» difference, that in the one-party State its leaders only remain at the head, whereas in the multi-party State the leaders change. This doubledealer puts the bourgeois parties on a par with the Bolshevik Party founded by the Russian revolutionaries with Lenin at the head. To him, the leadership of the State and society by the genuine party of the communists is no different from the rule of the bourgeoisie through the multi-party system. This proves once again that the Titoites, like the bourgeoisie, consider political parties and the State as institutions that allegedly stand above classes.

If the working class is waging a life-and-death struggle against the bourgeoisie, and these two classes are organized in political parties to defend their own antagonistic interests and to rule the society, this does not mean that the party of the working class, the Marxist-Leninist Party, is no different from the bourgeois party. On the contrary. When the communist party in Yugoslavia was transformed into a bourgeois party by no means did it become a party above classes, but was transformed from the vanguard of the working class into an instrument of the bourgeoisie. It lost only its proletarian class charac-

ter, but not its class character in general, because it became the party of the new bourgeois class. The difference between a communist party and a bourgeois party in State leadership is not a «minor» one, but a very great, profound, class difference of principle, which cannot be reduced to the «rotation» of party leaders in the political power, as this renegade claims.

With these «theories» about the «minor difference» between the bourgeois political system and the socialist system, the bourgeois party and the Marxist-Leninist Party, the Yugoslav revisionists want to say that their race towards capitalism should not be taken as something of great consequence. It is quite obvious that the Yugoslav revisionists cannot reflect in theory positions different from those they have maintained in practice.

Prattling about the «shortcomings of the one-party system», hence, trying to attack the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union of the time of Lenin and Stalin, in this way Kardelj writes, «First of all, the tendency of personal union of the chiefs of the party with the State executive apparatus manifests itself in it, and in this manner it becomes an instrument for the operation of techno-bureaucratic tendencies in society» (p. 64).

In order «to escape» this «techno-bureaucracy» and this tendency to «personal union of the chiefs of the party with the State executive apparatus in socialism», which they arbitrarily attribute to the bolsheviks, Messers, the Yugoslav revisionists have created their own system which is nothing but a dictatorship of the Titoite group.

In the so-called assemblies of self-adminis-

trative communities and in their executive apparatuses, as the author of the book himself admits, «...bureaucratic-centrist tendencies are now manifesting themselves in a very powerful way» (p. 232). In Yugoslavia the executive power is manipulated by Tito and the clique around him. Despite all their assurances that allegedly they do not aspire to power, the President of the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia is President of the Yugoslav State for life, and all the functionaries with key posts in the State, the Army, the economy, the foreign policy, culture, the social organizations, etc., also hold important positions in the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia. The whole thing is that, while they assail the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the leadership of the proletarian party in socialist society, in practice, the Yugoslav revisionists try to keep a tight hold on the reins of State power. The so-called Presidency of Yugoslavia was not created there in order to ensure collective State leadership, to fight the bureaucracy on which it relies, or to defend the Yugoslav State from the dominant forces outside it, as we have sometimes heard it said, but in a desperate effort to ensure the domination of Titoism after the death of Tito. This shows that not only in its content but also in its form the Yugoslav regime is nothing but a capitalist State which oppresses the people while trying to disguise itself behind deceptive slogans.

Kardelj cannot erase that black period in Yugoslavia's history when, as a result of the betrayal by the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and the establishment of the Titoite dictatorship, the peoples of this country suffered on their own backs the injustices, violen-

ce and the most unrestrained terror. Kardelj, the Titoite spokesman, tries to gloss over this period of darkness with a few slogans in order to persuade the peoples of Yugoslavia not to complain of their sufferings, by saying, «our socialist revolution too, in its initial phase, sanctioned a particular form of one-party system of revolutionary democracy, though never in its 'classical' Stalinist form» (pp. 64-63). This brazen renegade dares to speak ill of the «classical Stalinist form», which was a form so democratic and socialist that not only could the Tito-Kardelj-Rankovich regime never come anywhere near it, but it is an insult even to compare it. The monstrous crimes perpetrated in Yugoslavia were not in the period of friendship with Stalin and the Soviet Union of his time, but precisely after this friendship was broken, when Yugoslavia openly embarked on the road of «self-administration».

At present in Yugoslavia, according to Kardelj's «theory», the personal union of the executive organs of the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia with the executive organs of the State has been «totally» and «radically» done away with, allegedly because the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia has no prerogative to perform the role of the leading ideological and political force in society. Its role is only to exert its influence on the masses.

But how and for what is this League to exert its influence on the masses when it has no prerogative to lead? In no way at all. In a moment of despair Tito has admitted, «the League of Communists of Yugoslavia has been reduced to an amorphous, apolitical organization». But Kardelj, with a view to preventing the Titoites being

shown up in their true colours, corrected his boss, by writing that allegedly the «...League of Communists has become one of the most powerful pillars of the democracy of the new type — the democracy of the pluralism of self-governing interests» (p. 65).

If the Yugoslav «self-administration» has deprived the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia of political leadership, it is obvious that this «self-administration» has also automatically divested the working class of its political role, since this class can enjoy its prerogatives only through its vanguard, the communist party. If the vanguard of the class is deprived of its leading prerogatives, it is absurd to claim that the class exercises the rights which belong to it. Under these circumstances, it is self-evident just how much the proletariat and the other working masses can be «self-governing» under this sort of democracy «of a new type»! Here is what Kardelj says in regard to this question: «The League of Communists does not exercise its rule through the political monopoly, but expresses a specific, but very important form from the socio-historical viewpoint of the interests of the working class, and along with this, the interests of all the working people and society — in the system of self-administration and the State of the working class and the working people, a system which is based on the democratic pluralism of the interests of self-governing subjects» (pp. 65-66).

All this highfaluting and confused phraseology shows only the incontestable fact that in Yugoslavia the party counts for nothing, that

it exists only on paper. Although formally he defends the standpoint of strengthening the role of the party, as he understands this role, Kardelj could not avoid such admissions as: «...The League of Communists of Yugoslavia is not suficiently present politically and creatively... in the whole democratic system of self-administration and the creation of the policy and practice of the other socio-political organizations...» (pp. 263-264). Then where is the League present, when apparently it is not present in the directions it should be, when as the TANJUG news agency reported recently, two thirds of the villages in Yugoslavia have no basic organizations of the League of «Communists» at all? The answer to this question is too unpleasant for Kardelj to give, but a concrete analysis of its practical activity proves beyond all doubt that, as a «party of the communists» it is not present anywhere, whereas as the party of the new Yugoslav bourgeoisie and the Titoite fascist dictatorship, it can be found everywhere.

In this Yugoslav «self-administrative socialism», which Kardelj has undertaken to expound «theoretically», the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia always has a specific position. This specific position which can be seen everywhere in the pages of the book, can be interpreted as one likes, that is, as a specific position in the education of the workers, a specific position in relation to the proletariat, a specific position in the so-called system of delegates, in which it must not take part and lead for fear of its «political monopoly», and other such specifics. This party with such an endless series of specific positions, has the right, within the framework of

the delegation of the so-called Socialist League of the Working People of Yugoslavia, to its own delegation to Assemblies, through which it collaborates with the other «self-administrative» delegations. This shows that the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia has no independent political power and has long been serving as an agency of anarchist Yugoslav federalism. It exists to give satisfaction to the foreign capital, which has entrenched itself in Yugoslavia, to reassure it that «self-administration» does not infringe the system of private ownership, that no party, whatever it is, will change the course of this anarcho-syndicalist state.

According to E. Kardelj, the role of the individual in society is everything, whereas the working class and its party are nothing. According to him, the vanguard of the working class turns out to be not the Marxist-Leninist Party but the «self-governing communities», an abstract organization invented to show some allegedly great thing, which has never really existed. This revisionist does not see the working class as the leading class of society, but confuses it with the entire mass of working people. The whole Yugoslav people, he says, can be called a vanguard, of course placing man who «freely» (that is, in an anarchist way) expresses himself and realizes his aims (in this anarchist society) at the head of this vanguard. From this reasoning by Kardelj it is clear that the working class in Yugoslavia has long since ceased to act as a united class and has lost the role of the leading class in Yugoslav society. With the party and the State power no longer in its hands, the Yugoslav working class not only is not in power, but is put in the position

of a class exploited by the new bourgeoisie which rules the working masses through the State power it manipulates.

To escape the accusation that his stand denying the leading role of the party and the working class is betrayal of the interests of this class, this notorious traitor has extracted the following quotations from the «Manifesto of the Communist Party» by Marx and Engels: «The communists do not form a separate party opposed to other working class parties», «they have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole», «they do not set up any sectarian principle of their own by which to shape and mould the proletarian movement». With these quotations Kardelj wants to create the impression that Marx and Engels were allegedly of the opinion that the communists have no need for a party of their own, as it is not a party with characteristics, interests and principles different from those of other workers' parties. What a renegade! Entirely devoid of conscience, he sees the proletariat through the spectacles of an anti-Marxist social-democrat, as an amorphous mass which is allegedly fighting for general interests but which has no principles, no class or revolutionary orientation, no fighting program of how it is to win its rights!

In the second chapter of the «Manifesto of the Communist Party», this work of scientific communism, Marx and Engels brilliantly defined the historic mission of the communist party, as an inseparable part of the working class, as its vanguard detachment, etc., but never have they said that the communists should not have their own party. On the contrary, it was precisely so the

communists would have their own party that they wrote the Manifesto of this party, which was considered as the first scientific programmatic document of communism.

5. — Ideo-political Pluralism, «Democracy» and «Socialist» Construction in Yugoslavia

With his theory Kardelj puts the «pluralism of the interests of working people» in the forefront, and in this pluralism he especially emphasizes the role of the so-called Socialist League of Working People, which according to him, is able to unite all the social forces, regardless of their ideological differences. In reality, this «Socialist League» is an association which exists only formally and which counts for nothing. Kardelj rather lets out the truth on this when he writes, «I think it is no exaggeration to say that the underrating of the social role of the Socialist League... is a phenomenon fairly widespread in the League of Communists, and indeed, not only among the rank-and-file» (pp. 272-273). Further on, talking about the activity of this «association of all organized forces of society», as they call it in Yugoslavia, Kardelj is again forced to mention its formal character when writing, «...The Socialist League frequently solves problems more in appearance, that is, through resolutions and declarations, and less in reality...» (p. 276). These admissions of what Kardelj treats simply as some weak points, are sufficient to prove incontestably what this lifeless association represents.

According to Kardelj, the pluralism of «so-

cialist self-administration» is expressed in the context of the «Socialist League», which includes all the «progressive democratic tendencies» (all trends, even the regressive ones) and whose representatives are entitled to have their say and decide on the policy of Yugoslavia. In reality, apart from the Tito clique nobody else can take decisions on this front, which Kardelj calls pluralism of «self-administrative» interests, in order to show that Yugoslavia is allegedly not for the creation of many parties but for a single party on condition that it is not the only force which leads the society.

«...The League of Communists of Yugoslavia,» says Kardelj, «has a special political responsibility in society, which - naturally - it shares with all other socialist social forces...» (p. 74), and because there is such a sharing of responsabilities, «democratic pluralism» is supposed to exist in Yugoslavia. According to him, «democratic pluralism», that is, not multi-party pluralism but pluralism within the framework of the «Socialist League», which also preserves the one-party system, is more suitable to Yugoslavia. In other words, this idea means that the so-called «League of Communists» and other «social-political organizations» which are «...independent organisms...» in which the so-called League of Communists takes part and co-operates as a component part of them», operate «within the framework of the Socialist League...» (p. 267).

Without dwelling any longer on this, we can say that, whether it is called «democratic pluralism», «pluralism of the interests of working people», or any other name, in fact, this pluralism has only formal differences from bourgeois plu-

ralism. If in a capitalist state, there are many parties which are active and influential in Parliament, expressing the interests of the main strata of the bourgeoisie or some other class, in Yugoslavia, likewise, the League of «Communists» operates along with other leagues, which are not called parties but social-political organizations, which try to express the interests of the petty-bourgeoisie, the worker aristocracy, etc., etc., and defend these interests in the Yugoslav capitalist State. For these reasons, the conclusion of the Yugoslav revisionists that «not only is our political system not a one-party system, but it rules out such a system in the same way as it rules out the multi-party pluralism of bourgeois society», is an absurdity, a thesis borrowed from the anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists against whom Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin waged a stern struggle.

The theory advocated by Kardelj on «political pluralism», equal rights for different parties in the socialist State, of reciprocal control, etc. will also suit Hua Kuo-feng and Teng Hsiao-ping.

While boasting about the directions of the development of the political system of «socialist self-administration», in order not to overdo it, Kardelj is forced to admit that there also exist exaggerations, mistakes, and shortcomings, because «In many spheres the new relations are not yet in existence or functioning satisfactorily» (p. 26). But even if he did not admit this, the Yugoslav reality is proving every day that this «self-administration» has reached an impasse, therefore those who are closely acquainted with Yugoslavia and its political system cannot believe his consoling statements describing «self-

administration» as the «most highly developed socialist system».

The political system of «self-administration» is a brazen disguise to cover up the revisionist betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, scientific socialism and communism. The Yugoslav Titoites, as anti-Marxists, are not and never have been for the construction of socialism, but for the perpetuation of capitalism in different forms. They are trying to concoct all sorts of «theories» with the aim of, at least, delaying the process of decay of the capitalist social order, since they are powerless to halt it. For the Yugoslav revisionists, any people and any State can build socialism without basing themselves on universal laws and principles, or the Marxist-Leninist ideology. They do not accept that socialism can be only one socio-economic system and claim that various forms of socialism can exist. Deliberately misusing and distorting the correct Marxist-Leninist thesis about the creative application of the ideology of the working class in accordance with the special conditions of each country, they insist that there are no universal laws for the construction of socialism in all countries, and that every country can build a «socialism» different from the others, according to its own way.

The truth is that for the construction of socialism it is absolutely required that the concrete conditions of each country should be taken into account, but in every country socialism can be built only on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, on the basis of laws and principles common to all countries, laws and principles from which you cannot deviate if you do not wish to end up in capitalism, as Yugoslavia.

In order to «substantiate» the thesis that each country should build its own specific socialism, the Yugoslav revisionists say, through Kardelj, that «socialist self-administration cannot be imposed, for instance, on the bourgeois democracies of Europe or the American democracy», because they have not yet attained the conditions Yugoslavia has. According to them, the advance to socialism can be made either through the political pluralism of the Western parliamentary system or even without such pluralism. Hence, any country can build its specific socialism without relying on any experience, not even the theory of scientific socialism of Marx and Engels. However, since they present «their self-administration» as the finest system on earth, they think that regardless of the specific road that each country follows for the construction of socialism, this system can be adopted and applied on an international scale!

Impelled by his subjectivism and his unrestrained antipathy to the experience of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union in the time of Lenin and Stalin, Kardelj vents his anger so furiously on this experience and so greatly loses his balance of judgement that he calls it a reactionary process equal to the European-type political pluralism. Here is what he says: «Therefore, the attempts to impose the specific political pluralism of the European type, for example, where neither the conditions nor any need for such a system exist, truly play the same reactionary role in the contemporary social process as the attempts to have this or that 'model' of socialism imposed on countries which have neither the conditions nor the need for such a 'model'» (p. 49).

This whole tirade is simply playing with words with just one aim: to reject Marxism-Leninism and the universal laws of the construction of the socialist society, to deceive the masses and perpetuate the capitalist system, by painting it up in various «socialist» colours. This is why in his pot-boiler entitled «The directions of the Development of the Political System of Socialist Self-administration» he says not one word about really destroying the power of capital.

According to this «great Yugoslav ideologist», whereas the political pluralism of bourgeois parliamentarism is a system which transforms the individual into «an abstract political citizen», makes him passive and prevents him from becoming an exponent of concretely defined human or social interests, in Yugoslavia, on the contrary, there is allegedly no danger that the citizen may be transformed into an «abstract political citizen», because «self-administration» is supposed to teach him to defend his own concrete interests, in the first place! Like Kardelj's other theses, this thesis, too, is far from the truth. His «politicized» citizen in the capitalist countries is not sitting back with folded arms. True, in these countries, he has been denied his rights, true, the laws of capital have barred the paths to the defence of the interests of the working man, despite this, the workers there still strive and struggle to break the chains of capitalist slavery. Denial of this struggle that the working class is waging under capitalism, is contrary to the facts.

In the capitalist social order not all people obey the policy and norms of bourgeois morality. On the contrary, the overwhelming ma-

jority of the members of capitalist society — the proletariat and the other oppressed and exploited masses — not only do not obey the policy and morality of the bourgeoisie, but they oppose and resist them in many forms and by many means. Kardelj could not have failed to hear of this, but he distorts the facts in order to assert that allegedly under his «specific socialism» the individual, the man, the citizen, occupies the main place and is not «politicized» by the party, that under the political system of «self-administration», and only under this system, this concrete individual can easily defend his concrete interests! If we are consistent and reason through to the end according to Kardelj's logic, then we must accept the absurdity that over one million unemployed who are going short of food in Yugoslavia are suffering this fate not from any fault of the «self-government» system, but from their own negligence, because they have not bothered to defend their concrete interests! In «socialist self-administrative» Yugoslavia, the working people have been disarmed politically to such a degree that they are unable to defend even their most basic rights. In fact, the vast majority of them have been turned into people whose only concern is how to hang on to their jobs or find work, when they have none, how to ensure the means of livelihood within the country or abroad. It is true that very few working people are interested in what this «self-administration» system, «united labour», «democratic pluralism», etc. ere. This, too, is one of the aims of the Titoites who, with their invention of «self-administrative socialism», want the workers to involve themselves as

little as possible in defending their rights, to concern themselves as little as possible with politics, to pursue only their own narrow interests and neglect their common class interests.

In the system of bourgeois parliamentarism, according to Kardelj, the working class is inevitably «politicized», because trade-unionism and the trade-union struggle on their own do not lead it to political power. Further on he writes that such a «politicization» divides the working class into parties and thus, he claims, gives rise to the new danger that «the bureaucracy of the party» may begin to operate in the name of the class.

It is true that the struggle in the context of trade-unionism in the capitalist countries does not secure political power for the working class. That is why the workers organize themselves in political parties to defend their class interests. But Kardelj is not out to expose trade-unionism, nor the various «workers'» parties that are set up in the West, with which the Yugoslav revisionists are allied. He wants to show that these factors, from bourgeois parliamentarism and the bourgeois parties to the other parties, communist or revisionist, and the trade-unions, are all equally disruptive to the workers' movement and this is why, according to him, these parties should be done away with. The bourgeoisie and the revisionists are not upset by this stand of their friend, because they understand very well that Kardelj is talking about the liquidation of the genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties only, while the other parties of the bourgeoisie may exist, because these parties, whether they are one, two, or more, do not present any obstacle to the

transformation of the capitalist order into a «socialist order»!

It is not surprising that Kardelj writes «in theory» quite differently from the way matters stand in practice. With the theoretical fairy tales he spins, this charlatan is hiding the many manipulations which have gone on in Yugoslavia in order to transform that society, which initially, just for the sake of appearances had allegedly taken a certain socialist orientation, into a capitalist society. Although because of the position he defends, Kardelj is not and cannot be consistent, in fact, he stands for the bourgeois parliamentary system which he toils to present on paper as different from the «specific» Yugoslav system. His inconsistency is apparent when he does not completely reject that system, but describes it as a democratic system in which «...the working class and all the other democratic forces perform an important, progressive, historic role, when they fight for the strengthening of the social position of the Parliament and the extension of its authority as against the extra-parliamentary forces of power» (p. 55).

This «theorizing» of Kardelj is not in any way intended to expose the tendencies which can be seen today in the development of the capitalist State, where the executive power (the government) is continually extending its authority at the expense of the legislative power (Parliament), thus preparing the conditions for the transition to the establishment of fascism, when the monopoly bourgeoisie considers this necessary. He is not worried in the least about the increasing trend to fascism which is threatening many capitalist countries, today, because his

State, also, is on the same course. Therefore, he wants to prevent the working class from carrying out its historic mission by overturning the State power of the bourgeoisie through revolution, as Marx and Lenin teach. While writing in favour of bourgeois parliamentarism, he unintentionally reveals that strong pressures are being brought to bear on the Titoites in this direction, especially by big US and West-European capital which have investments in Yugoslavia. These pressures are exerted to ensure that the bourgeois democracy in Yugoslavia develops on a more extensive scale, that many parties: social-democratic, revisionist, «communist», etc., are created there. However, although the Yugoslav revisionists are not against the multi-party parliamentary system, still, they do not want to destroy their one-party system which they have publicized as «self-governing», not only because this would unmask them, but even more, for fear of the danger that might be created for the Titoites' monopoly in all State affairs, in the Army, the UDB and in the other organs of repression, as well as in the organs of deception for brainwashing the people with bourgeois ideas.

In reality, Kardelj does not reject what he calls «political monopoly» in the running of society and which he declares to be reserved as a privilege of the chiefs of the political parties and the executive organs of the bourgeois «democracy». That is, he does not reject the parliamentary and the extraparliamentary system, but he expresses apposition to «the remnants of this system» which, he alleges, socialism inherited in its original phases and forms.

It is obvious that, without attacking the form

of bourgeois parliamentarism, Kardelj seeks to oppose it to the State organs of genuine socialist society. These ideas are even more apparent when he says that, in the conditions when the means of production are nationalized, Parliament without the workers' «self-government» would be identical with the one-party political system of socialism, based on «the étatist form of social property». With the political system «in the étatist form of social property» Kardelj means our State power of people's councils, as well as the Soviet State power which Lenin established in the Soviet Union in order to build the new socialist society under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party.

In negating the aims of the October Revolution and the great work which was done for years on end under the leadership of Lenin, and later Stalin, for the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union, the revisionist Kardelj is labouring to prove that allegedly Yugoslavia, which has abolished the «étatist» social property and has transformed it into «socialized property», that it has not betrayed(!), as it is accused of doing, but has invented a genuinely «socialist» State, a «self-administrative socialism», and although «theoretically» he does not recommend it for all, his heart is set on having everybody follow it in practice.

According to Kardelj the one-party system in Yugoslavia no longer corresponds to their variant of «specific socialism». It was imposed, at first, because of the development of the socialist revolution as an element of the original structure of the dictatorship of the proletariat, whereas now it is described as «...incompatible

with the socio-economic and democratic relations of socialist self-administration and with its democratic pluralism or self-governing interests» (p. 63).

The Yugoslav revisionists pretend they do not agree with the multi-party system of rule of bourgeois society, and neither do they want to accept the leadership of the State and society by a single political party of the working class, therefore they claim to have discovered the «golden mean», the so-called «democratic pluralism». The truth is that the system of the Yugoslav «self-administration» contains elements of the «one-party System», as well as elements of «the multi-party system». But this mixed-up system is nothing but a capitalist system, an ugly offspring spawned by the Yugoslav bourgeoisie in order to rule the working masses and disguise itself behind a «Marxist» facade.

In order to malign Lenin and Stalin, the Titoite author wants to pit these two great leaders of the world proletariat against each other, to «prove» that allegedly they did not have identical concepts about the political system of of the socialist state. Look how he slanders: «Between Lenin's concept of the political system of the socialist State, and that of Stalin, there was a great incompatibility. The basis and the essence of Lenin's concept of the Soviet State power is direct democracy» (p. 67).

It is known world-wide that Stalin was a zealous disciple, a loyal friend and very close collaborator of Lenin's. Until now no one, apart from enemies, has dared to oppose Stalin to Lenin. These insinuations are made for hostile purposes, but the international communist and

workers' movement is used to the manoeuvres of the revisionists, who at one time declared themselves to be Marxist-Leninists, but «non-Stalinists», whereas now they are making efforts to oppose Lenin to Marx, and are discussing whether or not they should be only «Marxists», or «Marxist-Leninists». However, tomorrow, no doubt they will throw off all disguise and come out openly as renegades and traitors saying they do not stand for Marx, either. For this purpose, too, they will invent adequate «theories», which may be anything, but not communist or proletarian.

Lenin, as a true Marxist, spoke out for socialist democracy, the direct participation of the working class in running the country, and he put these revolutionary ideas into practice during the years he remained at the head of the Soviet State. Following him, Stalin continued on the same course. However, with socialist democracy and the direct participation of the masses in governing the country, Lenin did not in the least mean the weakening of the State of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the leading role of the Bolshevik Party. He never counterposed the dictatorship of the proletariat to genuine democracy, which he defined as

> *«...a state that is democratic* **in a new way (for the proletariat and the propertyless in general) and dictatorial in a new way** *(against the bourgeoisie)»(**1**).*

It is quite evident that Lenin was not, and never could be, for the replacement of the dictatorship

1 V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 25, p. 488, Alb, ed.

of the proletariat with this «self-administration» system which the Yugoslav revisionists invented in order to return to capitalism.

In the time of Lenin and Stalin, the class in power in the Soviet Union was the working class, which through its party, led, managed, planned and successfully carried out the tasks of the construction of socialism. In Yugoslavia they have totally disregarded the major role of the socialist State, which they have identified with the so-called «system of delegates», which, as Kardelj himself admits, has «...serious weaknesses in all the aspects of its functioning» (p. 213).

Kardelj himself understands that his reference to Lenin about democracy cannot serve him in the least to justify «self-administration», therefore, through sophistry, he tries to convince people that Lenin's idea «...is not elaborated right down to its factual consequences... but it is clear that its essence is precisely direct democracy, i.e., self-government» (p. 67). Kardelj «philosophizes» and seeks to make up for his lack of arguments with arbitrary and fantastic interpretations to his own liking. He seeks to persuade the reader that Lenin began well, but subsequently had no opportunity to develop the idea of «self-administration» further, as would have suited Tito's and his own appetite. The idea expressed by Lenin, that the proletariat would lead, organize, and run the Soviet power and govern the country through its party, has been and is fundamental to the Marxist-Leninist theory. It is precisely this essential question of theoretical and practical importance that the Titoites evade, and try to disguise this deviation by distorting Lenin's correct theses.

According to the Titoites, Stalin «...stood for a concept of indirect democracy, i.e., in essence he adopted the classical political system of the bourgeois State and its political pluralism except that he gave one party the role which the multi-party system has in the bourgeois parliamentary State» (p. 68). They allege that Stalin deviated(!) from the Leninist concepts, because he allegedly implemented «indirect democracy», running the State through one party which closely resembled the bourgeois parties and trappings of the parliamentary system. This is the «devastating» criticism this pseudo-Marxist makes of the activity and work of Joseph Stalin! Stalin, like Lenin, viewed democracy from the class angle, as a form of the political organization of society, as a political condition for drawing the masses into governing the country, to defend and strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat, to block the way to revisionist degeneration and restoration of capitalism. Stalin, as the Marxist-Leninist he was, was quite correctly sternly opposed to one-sided, liberal and anarchist concepts of democracy and took a stand against the petty-bourgeois distortions and misuse of the rights and freedoms that proletarian democracy ensures. And he was absolutely right. The revisionists, on the contrary, want to transform the proletarian democracy into a bourgeois democracy in theory, just as they have done in practice. This is why they are against Stalin.

The Yugoslav pseudo-Marxists justify their criticism of the genuine socialist system under the pretext that the notions of «worker» and «working class» have changed today, that changes have occurred, also, in the meaning of the

notion «citizen». According to them, «the working class has become an abstract political subject, which does not exercise power, but in whose name power should be exercised». Thus, this means that under a genuine socialist system, it is not the working class which exercises power, but someone else, who acts over the head of the working class on its behalf. This is a gross deception, a shameless distortion of the reality. This means to adopt the philosophical standpoint of idealism and to take as true, not what exists objectively, but what is only in your mind.

Proceeding from this position, the revisionist Kardelj comes out with the idea that, in the relations of production under the socialist order, in his relations with other workers, in his social position, etc., etc., the worker counts for nothing. And according to Kardelj, this is how «...the dogma of social ownership as State ownership is created, and along with this, the necessity for the centralized State, for the leading role of the State and party apparatus..., while the class interests and aspirations of the individual worker... are discredited and considered as acts transgressing the general laws...» (p. 70).

This is how Kardelj distorts the genuine socialist system and the socialist relations of production of the time of Lenin and Stalin, and consequently, the construction of socialism in our country, too. By speaking against democratic centralism, the leading role of the party, the State form of socialist ownership, etc., he wants to show «the superiority» of the system of «self-administration», but in reality, he exposes himself by coming out openly against the immortal ideas of the classics of Marxism-Leninism on

these cardinal problems. In fact these «accusations» he levels against us, rebound as counter-accusations against the Yugoslav political system of «self-administration». Now the Yugoslav reality is proving with each passing day, and will prove even more clearly tomorrow, precisely where the Tito and Kardelj clique is leading Yugoslavia, Its peoples and the working class.

The Titoites say that theirs is a «self-administrative» system. But who are those that govern themselves in Yugoslavia? The workers, the peasants? Neither the workers, nor the peasants. They are just as much oppresed as their counterparts in the capitalist countries. The «self-administrative» system is ruled by those who are at the apex of the pyramid, the new bourgeoisie, who have climbed on the backs the peoples by using the label of «communists», but who, in fact, are nothing but bourgeois technocrats who run the bureaucratic, étatist, fascist, State. The «delegates' assemblies», the State executive organs in the system of delegates, etc., are made up of such elements.

As is known, the mass organizations occupy a special position and play an important role In the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They are the levers through which the party is connected with the masses and implements the political rule of the working class and the socialist democracy. In socialism the social organizations are conveyers of the line of the proletarian party to the masses, powerful weapons of the revolution and the socialist construc-

tion, militant tribunes in which people's thinking bursts forth. Their task is to educate the masses and make them conscious of the need and capable of taking an active part in the socialist construction and government.

As component parts of the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, these organizations carry out their tasks under the leadership of the party of the working class, within the context of their own characteristics and specific nature.

The social organizations cannot operate in isolation from the proletarian party, from the other organizations and the socialist State. If the contrary were admitted, then, theoretically, it would be meaningless for them to be elements of a single system and, in practice, they would turn into lifeless organisms which would have no purpose and would perform no task to the advantage of the socialist social order.

In Yugoslavia the mass organizations, like the party and the State, have been treated and evaluated from out-and-out anarchist positions. Contrary to Lenin's idea that the mass organizations are

> *«...the closest and essential collaborators of State power...»(**1**).*

in that country, the idea has been upheld that co-operation of these organizations with the socialist State is a form of «bureaucratic étatism». Moreover, the Yugoslav revisionists conceive these organizations in such a way that each of them

1 V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 33, p. 202, Alb. ed.

can operate independently even from the party. Kardeljs says, «We have long since abandoned the world outlook according to which these organizations are supposed to be transmission belts of the League of Communists» (p. 267). This in no way implies that the single party in Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav State, which are in the hands of the bourgeoisie, have no power at all over these organizations. On the contrary, the Titoites have never renounced their manipulation of the masses through the social organizations, but in saying what he does, Kardelj is driving at something else. His intention is simply to undermine the links of the Marxist-Leninist Parties with the masses, whereas all revolutionary experience shows that these parties can create and maintain real links only with the masses organized in the respective organizations led by the proletarian party.

It is well known that the idea of the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist Party is closely linked with the idea of its revolutionary ideology, therefore, to detach the mass organizations from this party means to detach them from the Marxist-Leninist ideology, and to fill the vacuum with revisionist bourgeois ideology. This is clearly seen when Kardelj, speaking of man as member of the «Socialist League» writes: «... it is not laid down that his ideological viewpoints should always be in conformity with the ideology of Marxism in every sphere» (p. 280). This means that the Yugoslav workingman can be guided by bourgeois, feudal, fascist and other world autlooks and ideas, having the support of the regime in this ideological confusion.

The fact that the mass organizations are

component parts of the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, does not mean that they should be turned into «partners» or «appendages» of the State apparatus, under the disguise of «democracy» and of giving them some «State» competences, as has been done in the revisionist Soviet Union. Firmly adhering to Marxism-Leninism, the genuine party of the working class must be careful to ensure that the role of social organizations is not diminished, but grows steadily stronger. In Yugoslavia, as Kardelj writes, the phenomenon of the basic organizations of the trade-unions «...being appendages of the organs of management» (p. 295) is observed. This has occurred because the role of social organizations, their place in society and the relations they should have with the party and the State, have been defined from distorted positions.

In this book, Kardelj refers especially to the «Socialist League of the Working People», the trade-unions, the «League of Socialist Youth», etc., about which one could write and polemize at length. But here we have not gone into detail, deeming it better to emphasize only the deviations from principle by the Yugoslav revisionists in the organization, aims and activity of the mass organizations.

The Yugoslav revisionists also take a reactionary stand towards the role of religion and its ideology. As is known, religious ideology has always served the exploiting classes to oppress and exploit the working masses. It has been a means to implant in the minds of people the feeling of helplessness in the face of sufferings, misfortunes and misery. Religious ideology be-

muses people and paralyses their activity to transform nature and society. That is why, as is known, Marx compared religion to opium. He wrote,

> *«...Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world... Religion is the opium of the people»(**1**).*

Precisely because of the reactionary role it plays, the ruling classes have always supported religion and still do. In essence, the capitalists, the revisionists and the reactionary clergymen have one and the same language. The Marxist-Leninist Party cannot reconcile itself to religious ideology and its influence. The theoretical basis of the policy and program of a genuine party of the working class is the Marxist-Leninist philosophy, and not idealism and religion. The class struggle for the construction of socialism cannot be separated from the struggle against religion.

In Yugoslavia, religion has been assessed and treated in exactly the same way as in the other capitalist states. There, the poisoning of people's minds with religious ideology is considered as merely a private affair, and the party and the State are simply onlookers, because, according to them, religion «...is no obstacle for the religious man to integrate himself, on the basis of equality, into the socialist life of society (p. 178). It is self-evident what a fine socialism this is when the religious ideology is not at all in opposition to it, and when, as Kardelj writes, «For the overwhelming majority of religious

1 K. Marx - F. Engels, «On Religion», p. 45, Alb. ed.

working people socialism has become their most profound conviction...» (pp. 179-180). Now we are hearing from this «great philosopher» that even the clergy with profound idealist and religious convictions have allegedly fallen in love with socialism, with a social order based on Marxist philosophy, dialectical and historical materialism! If they read these phrases by the Titoite renegade, not only will the workers, communists and every honest man in the world be astonished, but even the clergy will laugh, since up to now, it has never crossed their minds to say that they love socialism, which they have cursed and are cursing whole-heartedly. Having reconciled themselves to religious ideology, it becomes even more clear how «Marxist» the Yugoslav revisionists are, how «materialist» their ideology is and, consequently, to what degree the political system of «self-administration», which is based on this ideology, is socialist.

The Party of Labour of Albania has consistently implemented the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the State of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist democracy, the leading and indivisible role of the party of the working class and the necessity of waging the class struggle. Our historical reality proves in the most convincing manner that, when the universal laws of Marxism-Leninism are implemented, taking account of the specific features of each country, the revolution triumphs and the process of the construction of socialist society cannot be halted. The example of Albania refutes the «theorizing» of the capi-

talist and revisionist philosophers against the dictatorship of the proletariat, the leading role of the party, and the waging of the class struggle.

Our great victories on the front of socialist construction are due, first of all, to our loyalty to Marxism-Leninism. If we have always triumphed over our enemies, this has come about precisely because we have been principled, honest and courageous revolutionaries.

Precisely because the practice of the socialist construction in Albania has embodied the Marxist-Leninist theory, it has been subjected to attacks from the enemies of this theory and it has attracted their fire.

We will clash boldly with the opponents of our ideology, because, when it is a question of defending the Marxist-Leninist principles, we cannot engage in underhand bargaining and compromises, such as the capitalists and the revisionists want to impose on us.

The struggle between the Marxist-Leninists and betrayers of the ideology of the proletariat continues and will continue until revisionism, which emerges and develops as an agency of the bourgeoisie and imperialism, is wiped from the face of the earth. It is our duty, as Marxist-Leninists, to defend the revolutionary world outlook of the working class. In the present conditions, when Chinese revisionism has been added to the old revisionism, this task has become even more imperative. To perform this duty successfully requires us to recognize, analyse and denounce the anti-Marxist and counter-revolutionary theories and practices of enemies

who, under the slogan of the «creative development of Marxism», and the «struggle against dogmatism», attack the Marxist doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the party of new type, first of all.

Socialist society grows stronger in struggle against its enemies, therefore we communists must stand in the forefront of this struggle until victory is achieved. We are revolutionaries and defend the socialist socio-economic order which is the new and most progressive order in the world, while the revisionists are reactionaries because they kowtow and capitulate to the old bourgeois order. The future is gloomy for our opponents and bright for us. However, the future does not come of itself, it must be carefully and continuously prepared with struggle in the fields of politics, ideology, economics, defence and so on.

Kardelj's book, like many others, which the bourgeoisie and international revisionism are publishing to propagate their reactionary, anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist ideas, must be exposed so that communists, workers and progressive people, who are not acquainted with the revisionist reality, or know it only slightly, are not deceived by its «left» slogans. In order to strengthen our vigilance, to be equal to the mission we are charged with as communists, we should recall Lenin's great observation,

> «*People always have been the stupid victims of deception and self-deception in politics, and always will be, until they learn*

*to see behind the different moral, religious, political and social phrases, declarations and promises, the interests of some particular class»(**1**).*

1 V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 19, p. 9, Alb. ed.

CONTENT

page

1. — A Brief Excursion in the History of the Titoite Revisionists 4

2. - The System of «Self-administration» in the Economy 19

3. - «Self-administration» and the Anarchist Views on the State. The National Question in Yugoslavia 41

4. - The System of «Self-administration» and the Negation of the Leading Role of the Party 64

5. - Ideo-political Pluralism, «Democracy» and «Socialist» Construction in Yugoslavia 77